

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL MONTEREY, CALIFORNIA



THESIS

HOMOSEXUALITY, MORALITY, AND MILITARY POLICY

by

Michael A. Peterson

March, 1997

Thesis Advisor:

Mark J. Eitelberg

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

19971113 052

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE			Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instruction, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188) Washington DC 20503.				
1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)	2. REPORT DATE March 1997	3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED Master's Thesis		
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE HOMOSEXUALITY, MORALITY, AND MILITARY POLICY		5. FUNDING NUMBERS		
6. AUTHOR(S) Michael A. Peterson				
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943-5000		8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER		
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)		10. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY REPORT NUMBER		
11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES The views expressed in this thesis are those of the author and do not reflect the official policy or position of the Department of Defense or the U.S. Government.				
12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.			12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE	
13. ABSTRACT (maximum 200 words) In December 1993, the Department of Defense issued directives that revised the military's exclusionary policy toward homosexuals. These directives marked the culmination of an intense period of public debate that placed little emphasis on the moral dimension of homosexuality. The objective of this thesis is to determine if personal religious beliefs of military members influence their responses to policies that they perceive to involve morality, specifically with regard to the 1993 proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military. The research approach involves two phases: a review of the religious heritage of the United States, the First Amendment to the Constitution, and the history of military policies toward homosexuals; and an analysis of the religious demographics of the active-duty military, the doctrines on homosexuality of the largest denominations represented in the military, and the expressed moral beliefs of active-duty members regarding homosexuality. The results indicate that the United States has a strong Christian heritage, and that the First Amendment to the Constitution was not written to exclude Christian moral influence from the public-decision making process. Demographic data shows that a majority of military personnel classify themselves as Christian. Also, various studies suggest that a majority of military personnel oppose homosexual integration into the military. The author concludes that opposition to homosexual integration from military personnel is likely influenced by Christian teaching. It is recommended that future research explore the implications of opposition based on religious belief.				
14. SUBJECT TERMS Homosexuality, Morality, First Amendment, Constitution, Religion, Christianity, "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue."			15. NUMBER OF PAGES 149	
			16. PRICE CODE	
17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF REPORT Unclassified	18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE Unclassified	19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF ABSTRACT Unclassified	20. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT UL	

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

HOMOSEXUALITY, MORALITY, AND MILITARY POLICY

Michael A. Peterson
Captain, Australian Regular Army
B.SC., University of New South Wales, 1987

Submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of


MASTER OF SCIENCE IN MANAGEMENT

from the

NAVAL POSTGRADUATE SCHOOL


March 1997

Author:



Michael A. Peterson


Approved by:



Mark J. Eitelberg, Thesis Advisor



Kevin R. Gue, Associate Advisor



Reuben T. Harris, Chairman,
Department of Systems Management

ABSTRACT

In December 1993, the Department of Defense issued directives that revised the military's exclusionary policy toward homosexuals. These directives marked the culmination of an intense period of public debate that placed little emphasis on the moral dimension of homosexuality. The objective of this thesis is to determine if personal religious beliefs of military members influence their responses to policies that they perceive to involve morality, specifically with regard to the 1993 proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military. The research approach involves two phases: a review of the religious heritage of the United States, the First Amendment to the Constitution, and the history of military policies toward homosexuals; and an analysis of the religious demographics of the active-duty military, the doctrines on homosexuality of the largest denominations represented in the military, and the expressed moral beliefs of active-duty members regarding homosexuality. The results indicate that the United States has a strong Christian heritage, and that the First Amendment to the Constitution was not written to exclude Christian moral influence from the public-decision making process. Demographic data shows that a majority of military personnel classify themselves as Christian. Also, various studies suggest that a majority of military personnel oppose homosexual integration into the military. The author concludes that opposition to homosexual integration from military personnel is likely influenced by Christian teaching. It is recommended that future research explore the implications of opposition based on religious belief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
A. POLITICAL SETTING	1
B. OBJECTIVES OF THE THESIS	7
C. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS	8
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	11
A. AMERICA’S FOUNDATION	11
B. THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE	16
C. MILITARY BACKGROUND TO HOMOSEXUAL SERVICE	25
III. METHODOLOGY	29
IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS	33
A. RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE ACTIVE DUTY FORCE	33
B. RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF THE MILITARY	43
C. RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY	50
D. CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONAL DOCTRINES	54
1. Roman Catholic Church	55
2. Baptist Church	59
a. Southern Baptist Convention	59

b. American Baptist Church	62
c. General Association of General Baptists	65
d. National Baptist Church	67
3. Methodist Church	67
4. Lutheran Church	69
5. Summary of Denominational Doctrines	73
E. SERVICE PERSONNEL SURVEYS	79
1. Army Survey	79
2. Air Force Survey	83
3. Active-Duty Force Survey	84
4. Summary of Service Personnel Surveys	87
V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
A. CONCLUSIONS	89
B. RECOMMENDATIONS	97
C. AREAS FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE RESEARCH	99
APPENDIX A: ENDORSING AGENT QUESTIONS.....	101
APPENDIX B: MILITARY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE ALTERNATIVES.....	103
APPENDIX C: RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE GROUPINGS.....	111
APPENDIX D: OTHER RELIGIONS AND CULTS.....	115
APPENDIX E: CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH - PART THREE, ARTICLE	

6, SECTION II - CHASTITY AND HOMOSEXUALITY	117
APPENDIX F: ROMAN CATHOLIC STATEMENT CONCERNING THE ADMITTANCE OF HOMOSEXUAL PERSONS TO MILITARY SERVICES.....	119
APPENDIX G: SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION RESOLUTION NO. 3 ON HOMOSEXUALITY, MILITARY SERVICE AND CIVIL RIGHTS.....	123
BIBLIOGRAPHY	127
A. BOOKS	127
B. STATEMENTS AND RESOLUTIONS	129
C. MISCELLANEOUS	130
INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST	135

LIST OF TABLES

1.	Distribution of U.S. Army Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996.....	38
2.	Distribution of U.S. Navy Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	39
3.	Distribution of U.S. Marine Corps Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	40
4.	Distribution of U.S. Air Force Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	41
5.	Distribution of U.S. Active-Duty Personnel ^a by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	42
6.	Distribution of U.S. Military Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	43
7.	Distribution of the U.S. Military Active-Duty Force by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	45
8.	Percentage Distribution of the U.S. Military Active-Duty Force by Religious Preference, Service, and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996	49
9.	Percentage Distribution of the U.S. Population by Religious Preference, 1994-96	52
10.	Attitudes of U.S. Army Personnel Concerning Potential Homosexual Integration, 1992-93.....	81

11.	Attitudes of U.S. Military Personnel Concerning Potential Homosexual Integration, 1993.....	85
-----	--	----

I. INTRODUCTION

A. POLITICAL SETTING

During the period from October 30, 1991 to February 5, 1994, public interest soared concerning the issue of homosexual integration into the U.S. military. On October 30, 1991, presidential candidate, Bill Clinton, indicated that he supported lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military;¹ and later, on November 11, 1992, as the president-elect, Mr. Clinton promised to lift the military ban on homosexuals.²

Within days of Clinton's statement, political opposition mounted against the initiative to integrate homosexuals into the military. Later, opposition expanded to include numerous military, church, and community leaders. The nation seemed divided over this issue. A January 1993 Newsweek poll suggested that almost half of the American population wanted the president to delay lifting the ban, if there were suggestions of morale and readiness problems, while 40 percent felt there should be no delay.³

A period of intense, and often heated, negotiations followed between those opposed and in favor of lifting the ban. On January 29, 1993, President Clinton directed the Secretary of Defense to issue an interim policy that would allow the Department of Defense (DOD) the opportunity to study the issue and provided Congress with time to

¹ Clinton, William, J., "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue," Press Conference, Transcribed by Grace, Steve, Internet, Xmosaic, July 19, 1993.

² Ambush, Peter, "Lifting the Gay Ban: A Chronology," Army Times, August 2, 1993, p. 16.

³ Cleveland, Fred E., and Ohl, Mark A., "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" - Policy Analysis and Interpretation, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1994, p. 3.

more fully exercise its authority, including the consideration of legislation and the holding of hearings.⁴ The interim policy directed DOD officials to stop asking recruits questions about their sexual orientation, and stated that anyone who announced his or her homosexuality would be placed in the nonactive duty status of standby reserve.⁵

On February 4, 1993, the Senate considered an amendment to the Family Leave Bill that would have maintained the exclusionary policy regarding homosexuals in the military. The measure was defeated by a vote of 62 to 37.⁶

On April 5, 1993, a Military Working Group was established by the Secretary of Defense to develop alternative options to meet the president's requirement of integrating homosexuals into the military.⁷ Later in that same month, the RAND Corporation's National Research Institute was commissioned to provide information to assist in the formulation of a draft policy for the integration of homosexuals into the military.⁸

Opposition continued to mount against the president's plan. General Colin Powell, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and General Carl Mundy, Commandant of the Marine Corps, publicly opposed the president's initiative. General Powell stated that "active and open homosexuality by members of the armed forces would have a negative

⁴ Burrelli, David F., "An Overview of the Debate on Homosexuals in the U.S. Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 20. U.S. Constitution, Article 1, Section 8, provides Congress with the power to "make rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces."

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Cleveland and Ohl, p. 4.

⁷ Ibid., p. 5.

⁸ Ambush, p. 16.

effect on military morale and discipline.”⁹

Numerous church leaders expressed opposition to the proposal. The Roman Catholic Church’s Military Ordinary Archbishop, Joseph T. Dimino, urged the president to maintain the exclusionary policy toward homosexuals in the military. He stated that the acceptance of homosexuals into the military would have “disastrous consequences on all concerned.”¹⁰ The Stated Clerk of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America, Reverend Paul R. Gilchrist, in a letter to the president, commented that the Presbyterian Church in America was “resolutely opposed to homosexual practice as incompatible with the temporal good of our nation and the eternal good of its people.” He urged President Clinton to “stand against any and every pressure that would be brought to bear on your Administration by those who would legitimize homosexual practices.”¹¹

The period from late April to May 1993 saw the greatest amount of political activity on this issue, with testimony being presented to the Senate Armed Services Committee and the House Committee on Armed Services from both supporters and opponents of the ban. Retired Army General H. Norman Schwarzkopf argued that severe consequences would be associated with lifting the ban. He testified that, when homosexuals were identified in units, “polarization occurred, violence sometimes followed, morale broke

⁹ Nunn, Sam, to Johanning, Kirk, March 22, 1993, Washington, D.C.

¹⁰ Dimino, Joseph T., to Clinton, William J., January 27, 1993, Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Silver Springs, Maryland.

¹¹ Gilchrist, Paul R., to Clinton, William J., June 17, 1993, Atlanta, Georgia.

down, and unit effectiveness suffered.”¹² Retired chaplain, Brigadier General James M. Hutchens, also argued against lifting the ban. He spoke of Christian, Jewish, and Muslim moral beliefs regarding homosexuality, and stated that all “are united in oppositions [sic] to homosexual behavior.”¹³

Supporters of President Clinton’s original initiative argued for removal of the ban based on “increasing tolerance for homosexuals in the democratic nations of the Western world,”¹⁴ and to achieve a “free[ing of] homosexuals, who, as we know, already serve in the Armed Forces, from the burdens of having to lie about their sexual orientations and wonder who was looking over their shoulders.”¹⁵ Others argued that the presumed consequences of lifting the ban were at best speculative, and should not be used to oppose lifting the ban.¹⁶

On July 19, 1993, the president, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, announced a compromise policy called “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue.” The policy was to take effect on October 1, 1993.¹⁷ However,

¹² Schwartzkopf, H. Norman, Testimony Before the United States Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1993.

¹³ Hutchens, James M., Testimony Before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, One Hundred Third Congress, Washington, D. C., May 4-5, 1993.

¹⁴ Segal, David R., Testimony Before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, One Hundred Third Congress, Washington, D. C., May 4-5, 1993.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ Korb, Lawrence, Testimony Before the United States Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1993.

¹⁷ Cleveland and Ohl, p. 11.

Congress continued to oppose the president's plan, and convened further hearings of the Senate Armed Services Committee.¹⁸ These hearings led to the Senate passing legislation on September 9, 1993, that proved to be similar to the president's July proposal. The House passed this legislation on September 28, 1993, and shortly thereafter, President Clinton signed the measure into law.¹⁹ On December 22, 1993, the Pentagon outlined regulations for the military to enforce the new law; and, on February 5, 1994, these regulations took effect.²⁰

The key difference between this policy and the previous one is the inclusion of a phrase stating that "a person's sexual orientation is considered a personal and private matter and is not a bar to service unless manifested by homosexual conduct."²¹ Homosexuality is no longer deemed "incompatible" with military service, unless it is manifest in homosexual conduct.

Another notable difference is the present requirement for commanders to hold the "gatekeeping" or screening function that had been previously held by recruiters. Commanders do not have the right to ask subordinates if they are homosexual, nor can they actively seek to identify homosexuals in their units. However, if they become aware of a subordinate who is involved in homosexual conduct, then they are required to take

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid, p. 12.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ "Defense Policy on Gays Takes Effect," Washington Post, March 2, 1994.

administrative action to remove that person from military service.²²

The “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue” policy is ambiguous in its wording. Research shows that it is not clearly understood by those who are required to enforce its requirements--the officers of the U.S. military.²³ It is not surprising, then, to find a fairly wide consensus that this policy is not likely to be the final resolution to the issue of homosexual service in the U.S. military.²⁴

It is interesting to note that little emphasis was placed on the moral dimension of homosexuality during the numerous debates, hearings, and interviews from October 1991 to February 1994. Brigadier General Hutchens made reference to this in his opening comments to the House Committee on Armed Services in 1993, when he stated:

I come to speak to that aspect of the homosexual issue represented by the “M” word. The word that for some reason or another has not been surfaced with the sufficient visibility to allow for debate. The word that has been tiptoed around by many in our political leadership for fear of unleashing the wrath of the homosexual movement of this country, the word about which the clergy in general and more specifically military chaplains could and should be speaking out with a voice of what the Scriptures refer to as a trumpet that sounds a clear call.

The “M” word, of course, is morality. I come to speak to the moral dimension of homosexuals in the military.²⁵

This lack of discussion with regard to the moral dimension of homosexuality is perplexing when one considers classical military teaching. Carl von Clausewitz argues

²² Sarbin, Theodore R., “The Deconstruction of Stereotypes: Homosexuality and Military Policy,” (Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center, Department of Defense), p. 15.

²³ See Cleveland and Ohl.

²⁴ Stanley, Sandra C. and Scott, Wilbur J., Eds., Guys and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 261.

²⁵ Hutchens, Ibid.

that moral considerations are among the most important in the time of war, and that “it is paltry philosophy if in the old fashioned way one lays down rules and principles in total disregard to moral values.”²⁶

B. OBJECTIVES OF THE THESIS

Analyzing the moral dimension of the proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military is one of the primary objectives of this thesis. The thesis is constructed in two parts. First, under the heading “Literature Review,” it seeks to determine if the United States has a history of incorporating moral principles in the formulation of public policy. It seeks to establish if the United States has a religious heritage, and what influence such a heritage may have had on the practice of national leadership by the Founding Fathers.²⁷

This portion of the research includes a study of the First Amendment to the Constitution and an analysis of the debate associated with the separation of church and state. It seeks to assess if the current interpretation of the First Amendment, which effectively excludes Christian moral principles from influencing national policy development, is consistent with earlier Supreme Court interpretations and the intentions of the Founding Fathers. The “Literature Review” concludes with a historical summary of the development of defense policy regarding homosexuals in the military. This is an effort to track the history of military policies from the 1770s to the 1990s.

²⁶ Von Clausewitz, Carl, On War, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976), p. 184.

²⁷ Throughout this thesis the term “Founding Fathers” will be used for the collective body of men who attended the Constitutional Convention of 1787 or were members of the First Congress.

The second part of the thesis, detailed in a chapter titled “Results and Analysis,” seeks to establish the current influence that religion has on members of the active-duty military. It reports the religious demographics of the active-duty military, the religious demographics of American society, and lists the official doctrines, with regard to homosexuals in the military, of the largest religions and Christian denominations represented in the active-duty military. Finally, the research concludes with an attempt to determine if the personal religious beliefs of military members influence their responses to policies involving morality.

Primary and subsidiary research questions were developed to help accomplish these objectives. These questions are presented and answered in Chapter IV of the thesis. The primary research question asks if the personal religious beliefs of military members influence their responses to policies involving the integration of homosexuals into the military.

C. ORGANIZATION OF THE THESIS

The thesis is presented in five chapters. Chapter II provides a review of America’s religious “heritage,” an analysis of the original intent of the First Amendment to the Constitution, and a historical background to DOD policies regarding homosexuals. Chapter III contains a review of the research methodology used in this thesis.

Chapter IV seeks to answer the primary and subsidiary thesis questions. It reports the dominant religion of service members, other religions represented in significant numbers in the military, and compares the military’s religious demographics to that of the general

population. Further, this chapter presents the doctrines of the seven largest Christian denominations represented in the military on the issue of homosexual integration into the military. Finally, the chapter seeks to answer the primary research question concerning the influence of personal religious beliefs on responses to policies involving morality.

Chapter V provides a summary of the thesis, presents recommendations, and identifies areas for further research.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. AMERICA'S FOUNDATION

It is appropriate to develop an understanding of the principles and practices upon which the United States was built, when considering public policy on issues as controversial and emotional as the integration of homosexuals into the military. This concept is best captured by President Woodrow Wilson in his observation that:

A nation which does not remember what it was yesterday, does not know what it is today, nor what it is trying to do. We are trying to do a futile thing if we do not know where we come from or what we have been about.²⁸

For this reason, close scrutiny should be made of the underlying principles and beliefs against which the Constitution was written.

The Pilgrims, in their first written governing document, "The Mayflower Compact," emphasized their allegiance to the Christian faith and their desire to seek and honor God. They began the document with the words: "In the name of God, Amen. We whose names are underwritten . . . having undertaken, for the glory of God and advancement of the Christian faith. . . ."²⁹

The early history of the United States was one of continual reaffirmation of this desire to identify as a Christian nation. The first Charter of Virginia, for example, specified that the "Virginia Colony should bring glory to Almighty God and advance the Christian

²⁸ Flood, Robert, The Rebirth of America, (Philadelphia: The Arthur S. Demoss Foundation, 1986), p. 12.

²⁹ McDonald, William, Documentary Source Book of American History, 1606-1889, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909), p. 19.

Faith.”³⁰ The Constitution of the New England Confederation, signed in 1643, stated: “Whereas we all came into these parts of America, with one and the same end and aim, namely, to advance the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ and to enjoy the Liberties of the Gospel in purity with peace.”³¹

The Constitution of the United States was written by men who instituted laws and government based on the tenets of the Old and New Testaments.³² The Bible was a basis of America’s system of laws, and the Constitution was written in accordance with Christian ideals and the desire to live Godly lives.³³ The Declaration of Independence makes four specific references to America’s dependence on God.³⁴ In 1820, Mr. Daniel Webster stated:

[M]ore than all, a government and a country were to commence with the very first foundations laid under the divine light of the Christian religion[.] Who would wish that his country’s existence had otherwise begun? Let us not forget the religious character of our origin.³⁵

The Continental Congress of 1775 officially called on all citizens to fast, pray, and confess their sins, that God might bless them.³⁶ John Adams, in his address to Congress

³⁰ Ray, Ronald D., Military Necessity & Homosexuality, (Louisville, KN: First Principles, Inc., 1993), p. 102.

³¹ McDonald, p. 46.

³² Ray, p. 95.

³³ Hart, Benjamin, Faith and Freedom: The Christian Roots of American Liberty, (Dallas: Lewis and Stanley, 1988).

³⁴ Ray, p. 102.

³⁵ Ibid.

³⁶ The Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905).

on July 2, 1776, spoke of a requirement to celebrate the deliverance of the American colonies from British rule, by solemn acts of devotion to God. An extract of this speech reads as follows:

The second day of July, 1776,³⁷ will be the most memorable epoch in the history of America, to be celebrated by succeeding generations as the great anniversary festival, commemorated as the day of deliverance by solemn acts of devotion to God Almighty from one end of the Continent to the other, from this time forward forevermore. You will think me transported with enthusiasm, but I am not. I am well aware of the toil, the blood, and treasure that it will cost us to maintain this Declaration and support and defend these states; yet, through all the gloom, I can see the rays of light and glory; that the end is worth all the means; that prosperity will triumph in that day's transaction, even though we shall rue, which I trust in God we shall not.³⁸

The centrality of Christian belief to the nation, and the necessity of its observance, has been advocated by successive presidents. President George Washington made numerous and frequent references of the necessity to incorporate religious principle into the national decision making process. He stated:

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports . . . Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle . . . it is impossible to govern rightly without God and the Bible.³⁹

President Washington pointed not only to the necessity of incorporating religious principle in the national decision making process, but also to the appropriateness of religious application to the nation as a whole. This is evidenced in his National Thanksgiving Proclamation of January 1, 1795, where he stated:

³⁷ The Declaration of Independence was proclaimed on July 2, 1776, but was signed on July 4, 1776.

³⁸ Millard, Catherine, The Rewriting of America's History, (Camp Hill, PN: Horizon House Publishers, 1991), p. 77.

³⁹ Halley, Henry, Halley's Bible Handbook, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1965), p. 18.

Deeply penetrated with this sediment, I George Washington, President of the United States, do recommend to all religious societies and denominations, and to all persons whomsoever, within the United States, to set apart and observe Thursday, the 19th day of February next, as a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, and on that day to meet together and render sincere and hearty thanks to the great Ruler of nations for the manifold and signal mercies which distinguish our lot as a nation . . .⁴⁰

President John Adams made numerous references to the necessity of national government to make laws by God's principles. He declared that it would be impossible to govern without God and the Ten Commandments.⁴¹ He saw the principles of Christianity as an essential element of good government and stated that:

The general principles on which the fathers achieved independence were . . . the general principles of Christianity. . . . I will avow that I then believed, and now believe, that those general principles of Christianity are as eternal and immutable as the existence and attributes of God."⁴²

The sixth president of the United States was another to hold this view. John Quincy Adams stated that "the highest glory of the American revolution was this: it connected in one the indissoluble bond, the principles of civil government with the principles of Christianity."⁴³

President Abraham Lincoln often looked to God and the Bible for guidance in leading the nation. He was the first president to use the term "This nation under God," with

⁴⁰ Millard, p. 62.

⁴¹ James Kennedy, D., "The Spiritual State of the Union," Gays in the Military - The Moral and Strategic Crisis, (Franklin, TN: Legacy Communications, 1993), p. 82.

⁴² Jefferson, Thomas, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XIII, pp.292-294. In a letter from John Adams to Thomas Jefferson on June 28, 1813.

⁴³ Barton, David, The Myth of Separation, (Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press, 1991), p. 125.; citing Wingate, Thornton, J., The Pulpit of the American Revolution, 1860, (Reprinted New York: Burt Franklin, 1970), p. xxix.

reference to the United States.⁴⁴ William Wolf summarized Lincoln's life as one interwoven with the application of Judeo-Christian principles. Wolf wrote of President Lincoln:

No president has ever had the detailed knowledge of the Bible that Lincoln had. No president has ever woven its thoughts and its rhythms into the warp and woof of his state papers as he did.⁴⁵

This aspect of Lincoln's presidency was evidenced in his "Second Inaugural Address," presented in 1865. In this address, he advocated that the outcome of national policy, with specific reference to the Civil War, would be the consequence of the establishment of God's purposes for the nation. He spoke openly of the Bible and prayer and incorporated scriptural references into his assessment of the Civil War.⁴⁶

The words and the actions of the Founding Fathers indicate strong Christian influence on the development of national policy from the "birth" of this nation. Not only did the Founding Fathers and early presidents advocate the inclusion of Christian principles in the public decision making process, they encouraged the citizens to appropriate religious principle into their lives. Further, they expressed a desire that the United States be identified as a Christian nation. Various presidents, including John Adams and Abraham Lincoln, looked to the Bible for guidance in leading the country.

Some, such as John Jay, the original Chief Justice of the U.S. Supreme Court and one

⁴⁴ Millard, p. 167.

⁴⁵ Wolf, William J., The Religion of Abraham Lincoln, (New York: Seabury Press, 1963).

⁴⁶ Lincoln, Abraham, Second Inaugural Address, 1865. Inscribed on the North Wall of the Lincoln Memorial, Washington D.C.

of the three men most responsible for the writing of the Constitution,⁴⁷ went further and advocated a national responsibility to elect Christian men to the presidency. In 1816 he declared:

Providence has given to our people the choice of their rulers, and it is the duty - as well as the privilege and interest - of our Christian nation to select and prefer Christians for their rulers.⁴⁸

The United States has a strong Christian heritage, and Christian principles have historically played a significant part in the national decision-making process. The nation has changed, however, and many believe that these principles no longer exert as strong an influence on the national decision-making process. Further, as noted by Brigadier General Hutchens, there is a reluctance to incorporate or even discuss Christian moral values on issues such as the integration of homosexuals into the military.

B. THE SEPARATION OF CHURCH AND STATE

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States is the authority used by those seeking to determine the appropriate relationship between the church and the state in this country. Many modern commentators contend that the church has no place in the affairs of the state, and base their views on the Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment. Further, many believe that it is inappropriate to even incorporate discussions of religious principles in areas of state policy, such as the integration of

⁴⁷ Barton, David, America's Godly Heritage, (Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press), 1993, p. 7.

⁴⁸ Johnson, Henry P., Ed., The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay, 1794 -1826, (Reprinted NY: Burt Franklin, 1970), Vol. IV, p. 393.

homosexuals into the military.

In an effort to review the legitimacy of such thought, the Supreme Court's interpretation of the First Amendment is examined. Its interpretation is contrasted against historical Supreme Court interpretations of the First Amendment and the intentions of the Founding Fathers, in issuing the First Amendment.

The First Amendment states that:

Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.⁴⁹

The First Amendment was added to the Constitution in 1791,⁵⁰ but it was not until the twentieth century, in the *Everson v. Board of Education* Case in 1947, that the Supreme Court offered its current interpretation of the First Amendment.⁵¹ Based its interpretation on historical facts and citing documents of historical significance, the Court concluded that the "First Amendment has erected a wall between church and state . . . [which] must be kept high and impregnable."⁵² Justice Hugo Black, in defining the majority position, stated that: "Neither a state nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another."⁵³ Even

⁴⁹ First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America.

⁵⁰ Dreisbach, Daniel, Real Threat and Mere Shadow: Religious Liberty and the First Amendment, (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1987), p. xiv.

⁵¹ *Everson v. Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

⁵² *Ibid.*, at 18.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, at 15.

the minority opinion, as stated by Justice Wiley Rutledge, concludes that the church and the state should be separated. Rutledge stated that the purpose of the First Amendment was “to uproot” all religious establishments and “to create a complete separation of the spheres of religious activity and civil authority by comprehensively forbidding every form of public aid or support for religion.”⁵⁴

In its interpretation of the First Amendment, the Supreme Court sought to capture the intent of the nation’s Founding Fathers. Its interpretation ultimately rested on its interpretation of the writings of Thomas Jefferson and James Madison with regard to church-state separation.⁵⁵ The interpretive approach used by the Supreme Court laid the foundation for virtually every subsequent church-state case brought before the courts.⁵⁶

However, prior to 1947, the Supreme Court had made numerous rulings regarding the First Amendment, with quite different conclusions.⁵⁷ In a 1853 challenge, a group of citizens petitioned Congress to separate Christian principles from the national process of government.⁵⁸ In its conclusions, the Judiciary Committee established to review the challenge stated that “the great, vital, and conservative element in our system [the thing that holds our system together] is the belief of our people in the pure doctrines and divine

⁵⁴ Ibid., at 31-32 (Rutledge, J., dissenting).

⁵⁵ Dreisbach, pp. xvi-xvii.

⁵⁶ Ibid., p. xvi.

⁵⁷ Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p. 10.

⁵⁸ Ibid., pp. 13-14.

truths of the Gospel of Jesus Christ.”⁵⁹ The committee explained that it was not possible to separate Christian principles from the American system of government and stated that these principles made America successful as a nation.⁶⁰

In 1878, a challenge was issued to the Supreme Court regarding the influence of Christian principles in the process of national government. In this case, the plaintiffs referred to a letter written in 1802 by Thomas Jefferson to the Baptists of Danbury, Connecticut, in which Jefferson used the phrase “separation of church and state.”⁶¹ (This letter was again referenced to in the Supreme Court’s 1947 interpretation).

Legal controversy existed for more than fifteen years, with the Court ruling that Christian principles should remain a part of official policy. The Court quoted Jefferson’s letter as one reason for “ensur[ing] that Christian principles remained a part of government.”⁶² In his letter, Jefferson stated that “the free exercise of religion [as assured in the First Amendment] was indeed an unalienable right and would not be meddled with by the government.”⁶³ He stated that the “wall of separation between church and state” was to “ensure that the government would never interfere with religious

⁵⁹ Morris, B. F., The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States, (Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864), p. 328.

⁶⁰ Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p. 14.

⁶¹ Reynolds v. U.S., 98 U.S. 145 (1878).

⁶² Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p. 14.

⁶³ Ibid., p.13.

activities.”⁶⁴

Later in 1892, the Supreme Court ruled that America “is a Christian nation,” and that “no purpose of action against religion can be imputed to any legislation, state or national, because this is a religious people.”⁶⁵ This statement is a significant one, because the Court based its ruling on 87 different historical precedents, including statements from the Founding Fathers, acts of the Founding Fathers, and acts of Congress.⁶⁶

In the 1947 interpretation, the Supreme Court for the first time interpreted the First Amendment to mean that Christian influence must be excluded from the public decision-making process. Additionally, it was the first time that the Court failed to cite all of Thomas Jefferson’s letter to the Danbury Baptists, choosing rather to site only eight words. These words were “a wall of separation between church and state.”⁶⁷

With regard to the intentions of the Founding Fathers, history points to a number of conclusions on which there is broad agreement with regard to the First Amendment.⁶⁸ First, the Founding Fathers sought to make it impossible for a national church to be established in the United States.⁶⁹ Their desire was to avoid the creation of a state

⁶⁴ Bergh, Albert Ellery, Ed., The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XVI, pp. 281-282.

⁶⁵ *Church of the Holy Trinity v. U.S.*, 143 U.S. 465, 471 (1892).

⁶⁶ Barton, America’s Godly Heritage, p. 10.

⁶⁷ Barton, David, The Myth of Separation, p. 11.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 65.

⁶⁹ Sky, Theodore, “The Establishment Clause, the Congress and the Schools: An Historical Perspective,” 52 Virginia Law Review 1395, (1966), p. 1416.

church, as had occurred in England. Additionally, they sought to protect individual denominations from federal preference being extended to one over another.⁷⁰

Second, it seems likely that the religious clauses protected individual states from federal interference in existing church-state relationships.⁷¹ Third, the religion clauses were designed to protect individual citizens from federal denial of free exercise of religion.⁷²

The Reverend Jasper Adams, cousin of President John Adams, was one who specifically addressed the issue of the First Amendment and its meaning to church-state relations. He declared that the United States was a Christian nation and interpreted the Amendment to mean that Congress was to make no change to the religion of the country.

In 1833 he wrote:

The people of the United States having, in this most solemn of all their enactments, professed themselves to be a Christian nation; and having expressed their confidence, that all employed in their service will practice the duties of the Christian faith; - and having, moreover, granted to all others the free exercise of their religion, have emphatically declared, that Congress shall make no change in the religion of the country.⁷³

In his writings, Adams noted, as have many modern commentators, that it was generally the practice to grant Protestant Christianity a legally preferred status to Judaism,

⁷⁰ Dreisbach, p. 65.

⁷¹ Ibid.

⁷² Dreisbach, pp. 65-66.

⁷³ Adams, Jasper, The Relation of Christianity to Civil Government in the United States, 2nd Edition, (Charleston, South Carolina: A. E. Miller, 1833), p. 13.

atheism, “dissention,” and Roman Catholicism well into the nineteenth century.⁷⁴ Adams and his contemporaries did not perceive this to be inconsistent with the prohibitions of the religion clauses of the First Amendment.⁷⁵

In the late 18th century, Justice Joseph Story stated that any notion that the Founding Fathers had framed the religion clauses to level all religions or to foster a strict policy of state neutrality would have met “universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation.”⁷⁶ Indeed, historian Rousas John Rushdoony argues that any attempt to separate religion, broadly defined, and the state is not only foreign to the purpose of the First Amendment, but also impossible. Rushdoony, much like Thomas Jefferson, contends that the emphasis of the First Amendment was on a separation of a specific church and the civil government, not a separation of religion from the state.⁷⁷ Rushdoony further contends that:

It is impossible to separate the two, and the idea of a nonreligious or religiously neutral state is a myth and a very dangerous myth. A state cannot exist without laws, and all laws are expressions of one or another religious faith. Laws are enacted morality, and procedures for the enforcement of morality. Laws and morality in general are expressions of religion, of ultimate concern, of a faith in what constitutes true and ultimate order. Every legal system is inescapably an establishment of religion. There can thus be no separation of religion and the state.⁷⁸

These sentiments are consistent with the words and actions of the Founding Fathers

⁷⁴ Dreisbach, p. 71.

⁷⁵ Adams, pp. 11-14.

⁷⁶ Story, Joseph, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 3rd Edition, Volume II, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1858), p. 631. Justice Story was an associate justice to the Supreme Court from 1811 to 1845.

⁷⁷ Rushdoony, Rousas John, “The Freedom of the Church,” Chalcedon Position Paper, No. 16, (1980).

⁷⁸ Rushdoony, Rousas John, “Religion and the State,” The Chalcedon Report, No. 152, (April 1978).

and early presidents of this nation, and are reinforced by the actions taken by the First Congress on September 25, 1789. One day after agreeing to the wording of the First Amendment, the Congress petitioned President Washington to recommend a day of national thanksgiving and prayer. This he endorsed by urging all Americans to “unite in most humbly offering our prayers and supplications to the great Lord and Ruler of the Nations, and beseech him to pardon our national and other transgressions.”⁷⁹ This action by the First Congress reinforces the argument that the First Amendment was not seeking to establish a separation of religion from the state.

The courts continue to interpret the First Amendment based on the 1947 Supreme Court interpretation, requiring the erection of “a wall between the church and the state.” Judge Eugene Nickerson, ruling on the 1995 case of Lieutenant Colonel Jane Able et al. v. United States of America,⁸⁰ explained that his task “is to determine the constitutionality of the policy adopted by Congress, not its morality.”⁸¹ The implication of this interpretation of the First Amendment is an exclusion of the influence of Christian moral principles from the public decision-making process.

Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Abraham Lincoln all spoke of a need to include Christian principles in the national decision making-process. Further, they warned

⁷⁹ Presidential Proclamation, October 3, 1789, in Richardson, James D., Ed., A Compilation of Messages and Papers of the Presidents, I, (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897), p. 56.

⁸⁰ Lieutenant Colonel Jane Able, et al. v. United States of America, No. 94 CV 0974, slip op., (E.D.N.Y., 1995). Regarding the military’s decision to discharge six service members based on their admissions of homosexuality.

⁸¹ Maginnis, Robert L., “Clinton Administration Scuttles First Court Test of Military’s Homosexual Law,” Family Research Council Report, IS95D1HM.

against rejecting these principles. In 1781, Thomas Jefferson warned against any effort to remove the Christian basis on which this nation was established, when he stated:

... can the liberties of a nation be thought secure when we have removed their only firm basis - a conviction in the minds of the people that these liberties are the gift of God? That they are not to be violated but with His wrath? Indeed I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just: that His justice cannot sleep forever.⁸²

Later, Benjamin Franklin, while speaking to the delegates at the Constitutional Convention, spoke of the need to ensure God's "concurring aid" to ensure prosperity. On June 28, 1787, he warned:

If a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We've been assured in sacred writing that, 'Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.'⁸³

Lincoln also warned against enacting national policy that is inconsistent with Christian principles. During the Civil War, he stated:

... I am not at all concerned about that, [having God on "our" side] for I know that the Lord is always on the side of the right. But it is my consistent anxiety and prayer that I and this nation should be on the Lord's side.⁸⁴

History suggests that, at the very least, the original intent of the First Amendment to the Constitution was not to erect an impregnable wall between the church and the state. This is significant, as the courts currently issue rulings based on the 1947 Supreme Court interpretation of the First Amendment that requires an "impregnable wall" to be erected.

⁸² Peterson, Merrill D., Ed., Jefferson's Writings, (NY: Liberty Classics of the United States Inc., 1984), p. 289.

⁸³ Madison, James, Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 (1787, reprinted NY: W.W. Norton Coy., 1987), pp. 209-210.

⁸⁴ McClure, J. B., Ed., Abraham Lincoln's Stories and Speeches, (Chicago: Rhodes and McClure Publishing Coy., 1896), pp. 185-186.

This “wall” is placing the United States in a position where laws based on Christian moral principles are being replaced by laws with no Christian moral basis.

C. MILITARY BACKGROUND TO HOMOSEXUAL SERVICE

Little is recorded of homosexual involvement in the U.S. military prior to the twentieth century. However, history does record the first known dismissal of a soldier for sodomy. Lieutenant Gotthold Enslin was dismissed and drummed out of the Continental Army on March 14, 1778 for crimes of sodomy and perjury.⁸⁵ Another controversial figure of that same period was the Prussian, Baron Frederich von Steuben. Von Steuben became the drill master of the Continental Army and a man “indispensable” to the success of the Revolution. In 1777, while in Germany, he received a letter that advised him that he was about to be prosecuted for “having taken familiarities with young boys which the law forbids and punishes severely.”⁸⁶ The impending scandal forced von Steuben to flee Europe and take up a position with the Continental Army. It is doubtful, however, that the Continental Army knew of this scandal when it sought von Steuben’s services, as the scandal did not receive broad circulation in Europe for more than a decade after the Revolutionary War. The acceptance of von Steuben by the Colonial Army “did not mean there was even tacit acceptance of homosexuality.”⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Shilts, Randy, Conduct Unbecoming: Lesbians and Gays in the U.S. Military, Vietnam to the Persian Gulf, (New York: St Martin’s Press, 1993) pp. 11-12.

⁸⁶ Shilts, p. 8., citing Palmer, John McAuley, General von Steuben, (Port Washington NY: Kenniket Press, 1966).

⁸⁷ Shilts, p. 11.

U.S. military law, prior to World War I, did not specifically address homosexuality, but the moral standards and norms of the day meant that homosexuality was not widely accepted by society. It was kept private or “in the closet.”⁸⁸ It would be an error to conclude “that the lack of specific language concerning homosexuality prior to this period meant that homosexuality, if not accepted, was at least a ‘non-issue.’”⁸⁹

Military legislation did, however, begin to appear toward the end of World War I. The Articles of War of 1916 was one of the first attempts to document legal restrictions on the service of homosexuals. It restricted consideration of sodomy, which had always been a civil crime, to cases of assault with the “intent to commit” sodomy.⁹⁰ Congress next enacted the Articles of War of 1920, which named sodomy (Article 93) as a specified military offense. The 1921 Manual for Courts-Martial further defined the issue of consent, pertaining to the sodomy laws, by stating that “both parties are liable as principals if each is adult and consents.” This definition was applicable to both homosexuals and heterosexuals.⁹¹

The Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) was enacted into law in 1950, and replaced all previous military judicial statutes. Article 125 of the UCMJ specifically banned acts of sodomy between members of the same or opposite sex. Cases of assault with the intent to commit sodomy were charged under Article 134, which prohibited “all

⁸⁸ Burrelli, p. 18.

⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 17.

⁹⁰ Davis, Jeffrey S., “Military Policy towards Homosexuals: Scientific, Historical and Legal Perspectives,” Military Law Review, 131, (Winter 1991), p. 115.

⁹¹ Burrelli, p. 17.

disorders and neglects to the prejudice of good order and discipline in the armed forces.”

Violations of either article could result in a dishonorable or bad conduct discharge.⁹²

From the 1860s to the mid-1970s, the U.S. military approached homosexuality in a variety of ways. Reasons for rejection of enlistment and removal of homosexuals from the ranks in the 1860s included: “Habitual and confirmed intemperance, or solitary vice.”⁹³

From 1921 until the eve of World War II, homosexuality was considered a personality disorder. Under the Roosevelt Administration, psychologists sought to identify and “treat” serving homosexuals. The military’s policy had changed further by the 1970s to one of separation and, in some cases, punishment of homosexuals.⁹⁴

In the late 1970s, the Carter Administration further revised the policy and included the statement that “homosexuality is incompatible with military service.” It recommended that cases involving homosexual tendencies or acts between consenting adults should result in honorable discharges. This policy was issued on January 16, 1981 by the Deputy Secretary of Defense.⁹⁵ The policy’s directive concerning homosexual discharges remained in effect until 1993. It is the most cited part of this policy and reads as follows:

Homosexuality is incompatible with military service. The presence in the military environment of persons who engage in homosexual conduct or who, by their statements, demonstrate a propensity to engage in homosexual conduct, seriously impairs the accomplishment of the military mission. The presence of such members adversely affects the ability of the Military Services to maintain discipline, good order, and morale;

⁹² Ibid., p. 18.

⁹³ Ordronaux, John, in Rutkow, Ira M., Ed., On the Examinations of Recruits and Discharge of Soldiers, (San Francisco: Norton, 1990), pp. 212, 223-224.

⁹⁴ Burrelli, p. 18.

⁹⁵ U.S. Department of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Memorandum, January 16, 1981.

to foster mutual trust and confidence among servicemembers; to ensure the integrity of the system of rank and command; to facilitate assignment and worldwide deployment of service members who frequently must live and work under close conditions affording minimal privacy; to recruit and retrain members of the Military Services; to maintain the public acceptability of military service; and to prevent breaches of security.⁹⁶

During the period from 1981 to 1993, numerous court rulings considering the policy on due process, equal protection of free speech, and privacy grounds upheld its legality.⁹⁷

Under this policy, individuals were asked if they were homosexual during the enlistment screening process. An affirmative answer was sufficient reason to deny entry, as the person “was reasoned to have been engaged in, or to have intended to engage in, homosexual behavior.”⁹⁸

The current policy regarding homosexuals in the military was released on December 21, 1993. The policy maintains the view that homosexual conduct is “incompatible with military service” and that it is a “threat to good order and discipline.” Its most notable difference from the previous policy is that homosexuality is no longer deemed incompatible with military service, unless it is manifest in homosexual conduct. The policy states that:

DoD judges the suitability of persons to serve in the armed forces on the basis of conduct and their ability to meet required standards of duty, performance, and discipline: to distinguish sexual orientation, which is personal and private, from homosexual conduct; and to make clear the procedural rights of the service member.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ U.S. Department of Defense, Directive No.1332.14, Enlisted Administrative Separation, January 28, 1982, 1-9-1-13.

⁹⁷ Burrelli, p.20.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Chief of Naval Operations, “Implementation of DoD Policy on Homosexual Conduct,” Message, March 1, 1994, p. 14.

III. METHODOLOGY

Concurrent to the literature review the researcher gathered demographic information on the religious preferences of active-duty personnel (from the chaplaincy departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force). This information detailed the religious preferences of all active-duty personnel in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force for the calendar year 1996.¹⁰⁰ Due to different recording mechanisms used by the Coast Guard, it was not possible to obtain data on the Coast Guard. This was not considered detrimental to the interpretative value of the data, due to the comparatively small number of persons in this branch of service. The Coast Guard has an active-duty strength of approximately 35,000, compared with an active-duty strength of 1,423,487 personnel in the other four services.¹⁰¹

The data provided by the chaplaincy departments detailed the numerical size of all Christian denominations, religious faith groups,¹⁰² atheists, and those uncertain of their religious preference or who recorded no preference. Each service submitted to the researcher a list of 162 options separated for officers and enlisted personnel. The Navy provided the only exception by submitting a much more general list of six options for its officers. These lists are explained in detail in Chapter IV.

¹⁰⁰ The Department of the Navy is responsible for chaplaincy support to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard.

¹⁰¹ These data are based on calendar year 1996 and were obtained from the chaplaincy department.

¹⁰² The terms “religious faith groups” or “faith groups” are used interchangeably by the author to define all religions, acknowledged by the military, other than Christian.

This information was extremely beneficial to the research because it enabled the identification of the largest Christian denominations and faith groups in the active duty force. The endorsing agents of these groups were contacted to determine doctrinal teaching on the issue of homosexuals in the military.¹⁰³ A threshold of 2 percent of the active-duty force was selected to determine which groups to contact. This threshold was sufficiently high to limit the number of groups to a manageable number. Endorsing agents were forwarded a list of questions regarding their doctrinal stance on the potential integration of homosexuals into the military and homosexual behavior in general. The questions forwarded to the groups are detailed in Appendix A. The questions were designed in such a way as to incorporate previous research by the researcher and to develop certain aspects of the present military policy toward homosexuals.

The questions were structured to include research conducted by the author in August 1996. At that time, two Protestant ministers, both from the Monterey Peninsula in California, were interviewed and asked a series of questions regarding their denominational positions on the issue of potential integration of homosexuals into the military.¹⁰⁴ Previous research had also established the position of the Roman Catholic Church on the topic of homosexuality, which is detailed in the Catechism of the Roman

¹⁰³ Each denomination and faith group has a point of contact with the chaplaincy department that acts as an intermediary between the denomination and the military. These are termed “endorsing agents,” and their responsibilities include providing guidance on issues of doctrine.

¹⁰⁴ The ministers interviewed were Dr. Andrew Strachan, Senior Pastor of First Baptist Church, Carmel Valley and Pastor Bill Holdridge, Senior Pastor of Calvary Chapel Monterey Bay. Both men pastor large community churches on the Monterey Peninsula, with congregations in excess of 500 people.

Catholic Church. These writings, accompanied by thoughts expressed by the senior chaplain of the Marine Corps in a sermon presented in 1993, helped to shape the tone of the questions.¹⁰⁵

Additionally, the author felt it important for the Christian denominations and faith groups to articulate their teachings on the difference between homosexual orientation and homosexual behavior. A distinction is drawn between “orientation” and “behavior” in the “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue” policy; and this distinction has become a subject of some confusion as well as controversy since the policy was first introduced.¹⁰⁶

The contact details of endorsing agents were obtained from the chaplaincy departments. Each endorsing agent was contacted via telephone and then faxed an explanatory letter and the list of questions. Endorsing agents were asked to submit a written response to the questions. Once responses were obtained, they were compared in an effort to identify areas of common thought.

The effect of religious influences on the views of individual service members was evaluated by reviewing three surveys of active-duty personnel conducted in 1992 and 1993 on the topic of the potential military service of homosexuals. These surveys were conducted by Dr. Laura L. Miller, a sociologist and researcher at Harvard University, the Department of the Air Force, and the Los Angeles Times. The results of these surveys were analyzed and compared with the religious doctrines obtained from the endorsing

¹⁰⁵ Ellis, Larry H., The Chaplain, United States Marine Corps, “The Ancient Curse,” Sermon by CAPT Ellis, 1993.

¹⁰⁶ See Cleveland and Ohl.

agents.

IV. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The objectives of this thesis, as stated in Chapter I, identify the direction of the research. Several research questions were developed to address the objectives, and these questions are presented below. The questions were used as a focal point and guide in developing the study methodology and in analyzing the results of the survey. The primary question is: Do the personal religious beliefs of military members influence their response to policies involving morality--specifically with regard to the 1993 proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military?

Subsidiary questions include:

1. What is the dominant religion of members of the U.S. military?
2. What religions, other than the most dominant one, are present in significant numbers in the U.S. military?
3. Does the U.S. military reflect society in its religious composition?
4. What are the doctrines of the major religions and Christian denominations regarding the issue of military service by homosexuals?

A. RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS OF THE ACTIVE DUTY FORCE

The analysis began by examining the religious demographics of the active-duty force for calendar year 1996. The chaplaincy departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force submitted data on the religious demographics of their active-duty personnel.

Additionally, the Navy submitted data on the Marine Corps. Each service forwarded its

data in a format that listed 162 religious preference alternatives. These alternatives included numerous Christian denominations, other faith groups, and categories for those who were uncertain or held no religious preference. The list of religious preference alternatives is detailed in Appendix B.

Each service follows a procedure in which it records the religious preference of all active-duty personnel upon joining that service. The services then maintain records of personal preferences throughout individual careers.

The Navy is the lone exception to the above procedure, and only in the case of its officer corps. Instead of keeping records of the individual religious preferences of its officers, the Navy conducts annual surveys to determine religious preference. A sample group is surveyed to determine representative percentages of major Christian denominations and faith groups. Additionally, the Navy does not use the list of religious options utilized by the other services for its officers, but simply records religious preferences in one of nine categories. These categories are: Protestant, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, Jew, Muslim, Buddhist, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Other Religions, and No Religious Preference.

Initial analysis of data provided by the services identified five Christian denominations that independently represented significant portions of the force. These were the Roman Catholic Church with 25 percent, the Baptist Church with 19 percent, the Lutheran Church with 3 percent, the Methodist Church with 3 percent, and the Southern Baptist Convention with 2 percent. These denominations were categorized as “dominant groups” within the force. Of the five denominations, however, only the Roman Catholic Church

and the Southern Baptist Convention were denominations in their own right. The other three represented groups of “like” denominations.¹⁰⁷

The religious data obtained from the services were complicated by the fact that a number of individual denominations, offered as religious preference alternatives, also met the definition that allowed them to be grouped into the general category of “like” denominations. For example, 22 individual Baptist denominations were recorded as well as the general category titled “Baptist Churches, Other.” Of the 22 categories, only the Southern Baptist Convention accounted for a significant percentage of the force. Chaplain G. Gibson, of the Navy’s Chaplain Corps, noted that service personnel are often just as likely to identify themselves by the general category as by their specific denomination.¹⁰⁸

In an attempt to reflect the actual size of the Protestant denominations and a number of the faith groups, all “like” groups were included into a general category, unless they individually accounted for more than 2 percent of the force. A threshold of 2 percent was established to allow for a clear delineation between the larger and smaller religious groups. Additionally, this threshold allowed for the identification of a workable number of religious groups for further analysis.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁷ “Like” denominations are defined as those denominations holding broadly similar doctrine and listing the general denominational title as a part of their individual title.

¹⁰⁸ Gibson, G., “Chaplaincy Department Procedures Regarding the Recording of Religious Preferences,” Telephone Interview with Chaplain G. Gibson, Bureau of Navy Personnel, January 14, 1997.

¹⁰⁹ Had the threshold been set at a lower percentage level, it would have significantly increased the number of groups to be interviewed, without producing a significant increase to the representativeness of the groups. For example, setting the cutoff at 1 percent would have required an additional four groups be interviewed and increased the representativeness from 55.6 to 60.5 percent. This improved

The grouping of “like” denominations increased the representativeness of the Baptist Church to 20 percent, the Methodist Church to 5 percent, and the Lutheran Church to 3.5 percent.¹¹⁰ It did not cause any group previously representing less than 2 percent of the active-duty force to exceed 2 percent. A listing of all groups that were combined to form general categories is in Appendix C.

Of the five dominant groups, Baptists, Lutherans, and Methodists required the identification of a representative denomination to enable further analysis. The largest denomination within each group was chosen to be the one “representative” of that denomination. In the case of the Baptist Church, however, three denominations were chosen, since the Baptists represented much more of the force than did the other two denominational groups. The denominations selected to represent these groups were the American Baptist Church, the General Association of General Baptists, the National Baptist Church, the United Methodist Church, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.¹¹¹ These, coupled with the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention, established a total of seven Christian denominations for analysis of doctrinal positions and teachings.

No other faith group accounted for more than 2 percent of the force. Fifteen of the

representativeness was not considered sufficient to compensate for the increased complexity of the additional groups.

¹¹⁰ These percentages were calculated without including the data provided on Navy officers. Once these data are included, it is no longer possible to accurately determine the representativeness of the Protestant denominations, Atheists, Hindus, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and those unsure of their religious preference.

¹¹¹ Arnold, Lindsey E., to Peterson, Mike, December 20, 1996, Monterey, California. These denominations were selected based on information provided by the Army Chief of Chaplains.

162 religious preferences were identified as non-Christian religions or cults. These groups, and the rationale for including them in this category, are detailed in Appendix D.

In addition to the Christian denominations and other faith groups, there were three categories that accounted for a significant portion of the force. These categories included personnel who failed to record a preference or who were unsure of their preference. These two groups were combined to account for 3 percent of the force, based on data excluding Navy officers. The third group was those who held no religious preference. This group consisted 20 percent of the force. Atheists represented 0.1 percent of the force.

Once all the “like” religious groups were combined to form the general categories, the data were examined to determine the composition of each service by religious preference. Tables 1 through 4 display the distribution of religious preferences for the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force.

Table 5 details the entire active-duty force, with the exclusion of Naval officers. This table is included, because it provides the most accurate reflection of Protestant denominational representation and the only indication of the representation of Atheists, Hindus, Jehovah’s Witnesses, and persons who were unsure of their religious preference. Table 6 details the distribution of the entire active-duty force, including Naval officers. It categorizes religious preference in accordance with the alternatives offered by the Navy to its officers.

Table 1. Distribution of U.S. Army Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	23	292	315	^a
Buddhist	113	675	788	0.2
Christian	70,480	280,107	350,587	72.1
- Protestant	44,018	200,093	244,111	50.2
-- Baptist	10,262	101,451	111,713	23.0
-- Episcopal	2,508	2,368	4,876	1.0
-- Lutheran	4,145	9,614	13,759	2.8
-- Methodist	6,229	16,896	23,125	4.8
-- Pentecostal	524	6,909	7,433	1.5
-- Presbyterian	2,616	3,008	5,624	1.2
-- Southern Baptist Convention	2,700	8,340	11,040	2.3
-- Protestant, Other	15,034	51,507	66,541	13.7
- Roman Catholic	26,261	79,844	106,105	21.8
- Orthodox	201	170	371	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	1,209	3,871	5,080	1.1
Hindu	35	90	125	^a
Jehovah's Witness	6	128	134	^a
Jew	725	788	1,513	0.3
Muslim	90	1,663	1,753	0.4
Other Religions	594	2,946	3,540	0.7
No Religious Preference	6,537	109,409	115,946	23.9
Unknown	1,806	4,515	6,321	1.3
TOTAL ^b	81,618	404,484	486,102	100.0

^a. Represents less than 0.05 percent.

^b. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Army Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D.C., July 16, 1996.

Table 2. Distribution of U.S. Navy Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	0	164	164	^a
Buddhist	399	575	974	0.2
Christian	47,363	257,298	304,661	71.7
- Protestant	27,358	163,956	191,314	45.1
-- Baptist	0	68,695	68,695	19.0 (16.2) ^b
-- Episcopal	0	2,841	2,841	0.8 (0.7) ^b
-- Lutheran	0	12,233	12,233	3.3 (2.9) ^b
-- Methodist	0	16,812	16,812	4.6 (4.0) ^b
-- Pentecostal	0	5,454	5,454	1.5 (1.3) ^b
-- Presbyterian	0	4,601	4,601	1.3 (1.1) ^b
-- Southern Baptist Convention	0	6,728	6,728	1.8 (1.6) ^b
-- Protestant, Other	0	46,592	44,680	12.9 (11.0) ^b
- Roman Catholic	19,948	93,057	113,005	26.6
- Orthodox	57	285	342	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	456	3,531	3,987	0.9
Hindu	0	71	71	^a
Jehovah's Witness	0	192	192	^a
Jew	342	921	1,263	0.3
Muslim	57	719	776	0.2
Other Religions	2,223	2,402	4,625	1.1
No Religious Preference	6,270	86,601	92,871	21.9
Unknown	0	15,115	15,115	3.6
TOTAL ^c	56,995	367,589	424,699	100.0

^a. Represents less than 0.05 percent. ^b. Numbers reflect enlisted percentage. Bracketed numbers reflect entire Navy percentage. ^c. Numbers may not add to 56,995 due to rounding. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Navy Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D.C., December 12, 1996.

Table 3. Distribution of U.S. Marine Corps Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	17	163	180	0.1
Buddhist	14	292	306	0.2
Christian	15,973	125,529	141,502	79.8
- Protestant	9,021	78,887	87,908	49.6
-- Baptist	1,752	33,447	35,199	19.9
-- Episcopal	675	1,085	1,760	1.0
-- Lutheran	941	5,435	6,376	3.6
-- Methodist	1,265	6,410	7,675	4.3
-- Pentecostal	66	2,816	2,882	1.6
-- Presbyterian	605	1,654	2,259	1.3
-- Southern Baptist Convention	290	1,340	1,630	0.9
-- Protestant, Other	3,427	26,700	30,127	17.0
- Roman Catholic	6,905	46,525	53,430	30.1
- Orthodox	47	117	164	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	178	1,716	1,894	1.1
Hindu	2	40	42	^a
Jehovah's Witness	1	37	38	^a
Jew	135	293	428	0.2
Muslim	11	526	537	0.3
Other Religions	93	824	917	0.5
No Religious Preference	1,032	23,913	24,945	14.1
Unknown	694	5,870	6,564	3.7
TOTAL ^b	18,150	159,203	177,353	100.0

^a. Represents less than 0.05 percent.

^b. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Navy Chief of Chaplains, Washington, D.C., December 12, 1996.

Table 4. Distribution of U.S. Air Force Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	80	482	562	0.1
Buddhist	75	415	490	0.1
Christian	58,373	260,234	318,607	81.0
- Protestant	37,027	180,823	217,850	55.4
-- Baptist	5,689	67,497	73,186	18.6
-- Episcopal	2,012	2,768	4,780	1.2
-- Lutheran	4,027	14,053	18,080	4.6
-- Methodist	5,476	17,093	22,569	5.7
-- Pentecostal	225	5,108	5,333	1.4
-- Presbyterian	2,471	4,416	6,887	1.8
-- Southern Baptist Convention	2,305	7,155	9,460	2.4
-- Protestant, Other	14,822	62,733	77,555	19.7
- Roman Catholic	21,205	79,181	100,386	25.5
- Orthodox	141	230	371	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	1,458	4,209	5,667	1.4
Hindu	42	85	127	^a
Jehovah's Witness	3	96	99	^a
Jew	616	1,593	2,209	0.6
Muslim	36	600	636	0.2
Other Religions	708	1,527	2,235	0.6
No Religious Preference	6,976	45,578	52,554	13.4
Unknown	9,242	1,015	10,257	2.6
TOTAL ^b	77,609	315,834	393,443	100.0

^a. Represents less than 0.05 percent.

^b. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Air Force Chief of Chaplaincy Services, Washington, D.C., December 9-10, 1996.

Table 5. Distribution of U.S. Active-Duty Personnel^a by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	120	1,101	1,221	0.1
Buddhist	202	1,957	2,159	0.2
Christian	144,826	923,168	1,067,994	75.0
- Protestant	90,066	623,759	713,825	50.1
-- Baptist	17,703	271,090	288,793	20.3
-- Episcopal	5,195	9,062	14,257	1.0
-- Lutheran	9,113	41,335	50,448	3.5
-- Methodist	12,970	57,211	70,181	4.9
-- Pentecostal	815	20,287	21,102	1.5
-- Presbyterian	5,692	13,679	19,371	1.4
-- Southern Baptist Convention	5,295	23,563	28,858	2.0
-- Protestant, Other	33,283	187,532	220,815	15.5
- Roman Catholic	54,371	298,607	352,978	24.8
- Orthodox	389	802	1,191	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	2,845	13,327	16,172	1.1
Hindu	79	286	365	^b
Jehovah's Witness	10	453	463	^b
Jew	1,476	3,595	5,071	0.4
Muslim	137	3,508	3,645	0.3
Other Religions	1,395	7,699	9,094	0.6
No Religious Preference	14,545	265,501	280,046	19.7
Unknown	11,742	26,515	38,257	2.7
TOTAL ^c	177,377	1,247,110	1,424,487	100.00

^a. Excluding Naval Officers. ^b. Represents less than 0.05 percent.

^c. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sources: Army Chief of Chaplains, Navy Chief of Chaplains, Air Force Chief of Chaplaincy Services, Washington, D.C., 1996, disregarding Naval officers.

Table 6. Distribution of U.S. Military Active-Duty Personnel by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Buddhist	601	1,957	2,558	0.2
Christian	192,189	923,168	1,115,357	75.3
- Protestant	117,424	623,759	741,183	50.0
- Roman Catholic	74,319	298,607	372,926	25.2
- Orthodox	446	802	1,248	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	3,301	13,327	16,628	1.1
Jew	1,818	3,595	5,413	0.4
Muslim	194	3,508	3,702	0.3
Other Religions	3,827	9,539	13,366	0.9
No Religious Preference	32,557	292,016	324,573	21.9
TOTAL	234,487	1,247,110	1,481,597	100.0*

* Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Army Chief of Chaplains, Navy Chief of Chaplains, Air Force Chief of Chaplaincy Services, Washington, D.C., 1996.

B. RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF THE MILITARY

Analysis of the data presented in Tables 1 through 4 provides sufficient information to answer three of the four subsidiary questions. However, the data presented at Tables 5 and 6 show significant variations in the percentages of personnel comprising the “Other Religions” and “No Religious Preference” categories, because of the Navy’s limitation on the number of alternative categories offered to its officers. By excluding the categories of Atheist, Hindu, Jehovah’s Witness, and “Unknown,” the representativeness of the “Other Religions” and “No Religious Preference” categories are inflated in Table 6.

Table 6 does, however, provide the most accurate reflection of the Buddhist, Christian (Protestant, Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christian), Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Jewish and Muslim faiths. At the same time, Table 5 provides the best indication of the representativeness of the Atheist, Hindu, Jehovah's Witness, individual Protestant denominations, "Other Religions," "No Religious Preference," and "Unknown" categories.

Tables 5 and 6 were combined in an effort to obtain the most accurate reflection of the distribution of all Christian denominations and other faith groups. The Atheist, Hindu, Jehovah's Witness, individual Protestant denominations, "Other Religions," "No Religious Preference," and "Unknown" categories from Table 5 were combined with the Buddhist, Christian (Protestant, Roman Catholic and Orthodox Christian), Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Jewish, and Muslim categories from Table 6 to produce Table 7.

Table 7 shows that Christianity is by far the largest religion in the U.S. active-duty military and that no other religion represents a significant proportion of the force. Tables 1 through 4 show that the Air Force includes the highest proportion of Christians with 81 percent, and that the Navy has the lowest proportion with 71.7 percent. In the other services, 79.8 percent of Marine Corps personnel and 72.1 percent of Army personnel identified themselves as Christian. The cumulative total of active-duty personnel belonging to the category of Christianity is 75.3 percent.

Apart from Christianity, the only other categories representing significant portions of the force were "No Religious Preference" and the "Unknown." The Army had the

Table 7. Distribution of the U.S. Military Active-Duty Force by Religious Preference and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Officer	Enlisted	Total	Percent
Atheist	120	1,101	1,221	0.1
Buddhist	601	1,957	2,558	0.2
Christian	192,189	923,168	1,115,357	75.3
- Protestant	117,424	623,759	741,183	50.0
-- Baptist	17,703	271,090	288,793	20.3
-- Episcopal	5,195	9,062	14,257	1.0
-- Lutheran	9,113	41,335	50,448	3.5
-- Methodist	12,970	57,211	70,181	4.9
-- Pentecostal	815	20,287	21,102	1.5
-- Presbyterian	5,692	13,679	19,371	1.4
-- Southern Baptist Convention	5,295	23,563	28,858	2.0
-- Protestant, Other	33,283	187,532	220,815	15.5
- Roman Catholic	74,319	298,607	372,926	25.2
- Orthodox	446	802	1,248	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	3,301	13,327	16,628	1.1
Hindu	79	286	365	^a
Jehovah's Witness	10	453	463	^a
Jew	1,818	3,595	5,413	0.4
Muslim	194	3,508	3,702	0.3
Other Religions	3,827	9,539	13,366	0.9
No Religious Preference	32,557	292,016	324,573	21.9
Unknown	11,742	26,515	38,257	2.7
TOTAL ^b	177,377	1,247,110	1,424,487	100.0

^a Represents less than 0.05 percent. ^b Numbers may not add to total as a consequence of combining Tables 5 and 6. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Army Chief of Chaplains, Navy Chief of Chaplains, Air Force Chief of Chaplaincy Services, Washington, D.C., 1996.

largest proportion of personnel in the “No Religious Preference” category, with 23.9 percent, and the lowest portion in the “Unknown” category, with 1.3 percent. The Navy recorded 21.9 percent with “No Religious Preference” and 3.6 percent as “Unknown.” The Marine Corps recorded 14.1 percent in the “No Religious Preference” category and 3.7 percent in the “Unknown” category, while the Air Force recorded 13.4 and 2.6 percent, respectively, in the two categories. The total of all personnel within the categories of “No Religious Preference” and “Unknown” is 19.7 and 2.7 percent, respectively.

The data recorded in Table 7 provide answers to the first and second subsidiary questions listed above. First, the dominant religion within the U.S. military is Christianity. At the same time, there are no other religions in the military representing a significant number (more than 2 percent) of active-duty personnel. Furthermore, data obtained from the services show that a significant portion of the force holds no religious preference.

Table 7 shows that, of the 75.3 percent of military personnel who identify themselves as Christian, 50 percent are Protestant and 25.2 percent are Catholic. Tables 1 through 4 identify a large number of denominations, and considerable representational variation among Protestant Christians in the services.

The Roman Catholic Church represents the largest denomination in the force, with 25.2 percent of active-duty personnel belonging to this category. The highest proportion of Roman Catholics is found in the Marine Corps, with 30.1 percent, and the lowest proportion is in the Army, with 21.8 percent. Additionally, Roman Catholics account for 26.6 percent of Navy personnel and 25.2 percent of personnel in the Air Force.

The second-largest denomination is the Baptist Church, representing 20.3 percent of the entire force, or 22.3 percent when the Southern Baptist Convention is included.¹¹²

The Army has the highest proportion of military personnel identified as members of the Baptist Church, including the Southern Baptist Convention, at 25.3 percent. The other services reported similar proportions of personnel in the Baptist Church, at about 21 percent.

Other denominations representing significant portions of the active-duty force include the Methodist Church, with 4.9 percent, and the Lutheran Church, with 3.5 percent. The Methodist Church achieved its highest representation in the Air Force, with 5.7 percent, and its lowest in the Marine Corps, with 4.3 percent. The Lutheran Church achieved its highest representation in the Air Force, with 4.6 percent, and its lowest in the Army, with 2.8 percent.

A number of other denominations represented from 1 to 2 percent of the active-duty force. These included the Pentecostal Church (1.5 percent), the Presbyterian Church (1.4 percent), and the Episcopal Church (1.0 percent). The largest faith group was the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with 1.1 percent. The Jewish, Muslim, and Buddhist faith groups represented 0.4 percent, 0.3 percent, and 0.2 percent of the force, respectively. The Hindu and Jehovah's Witness categories represent less than 0.1 percent of the force.

The proportion of personnel in faith groups was similar across the services. A slight

¹¹² The Southern Baptist Convention is a Baptist Church which was categorized separately to the other Baptist Churches because it represented more than 2 percent of the active-duty force.

variation was found for the category of “Other Religions,” which was somewhat higher in the Navy (1.1 percent) than in other services. The relatively higher proportion of “Other Religions” in the Navy may be a consequence of the Navy’s methodology for recording the religious preferences of its officers. The Navy also recorded 0.7 percent of its officers as members of the Buddhist faith. This is higher than the proportion recorded by any other service in either the officer or enlisted personnel categories. The percentage distribution by religious preference, service, and enlisted/officer status is presented in Table 8.

Table 8 shows significant variations between the officer and enlisted categories for the services in the Protestant, Roman Catholic, “No Religious Preference,” and “Unknown” categories. The most noticeable Protestant variation occurs in the Air Force, where there is a 9.6 percentage point under-representation in the officer corps (47.7 percent), compared with enlisted personnel (57.3 percent). In each of the other services, for the Protestant category, the officer corps is represented in greater proportions than in the enlisted ranks, but not to the same magnitude as the under-representation in the Air Force.

The Roman Catholic Church records the greatest variations of any religious category between the officer and enlisted categories. It records much higher representations among officers than enlisted personnel, in all services. The Roman Catholics record: a 12.5 percentage point over-representation in the officer corps of the Army (32.2 percent) than among its enlisted force (19.7 percent); a 9.7 percentage point over-representation in the officer corps of the Navy (35 percent) than its enlisted force (25.3 percent); and an 8.8 percentage point over-representation in the officer corps of the Marine Corps (38 percent)

Table 8. Percentage Distribution of the U.S. Military Active-Duty Force by Religious Preference, Service, and Officer/Enlisted Status, 1996

FAITH GROUP	Army Officer	Army Enlisted	Navy Officer	Navy Enlisted	Marine Corps Officer	Marine Corps Enlisted	Air Force Enlisted	Air Force Enlisted
Buddhist	0.1	0.2	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1
Protestant	53.9	49.5	48	44.6	49.7	49.6	47.7	57.3
Roman Catholic	32.2	19.7	35	25.3	38	29.2	27.3	25.1
Orthodox Christian	0.2	^a	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.1
Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints	1.5	1.0	0.8	1	1	1.1	1.9	1.3
Jew	0.9	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.7	0.2	0.8	0.5
Muslim	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	^a	0.3	^a	0.2
Other Religions	0.7	0.7	3.9	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.9	0.5
No Religious Preference	8	27	11	23.6	5.7	15	9	14.4
Atheist, Hindu, Jehovah's Witness	0.1	0.1	0	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2
Unknown	2.2	1.1	0	3.7	3.8	4.1	11.9	0.3
Total ^b	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

^a. Reflects a representation of less than 0.05 percent.

^b. Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Sources: Army Chief of Chaplains, Navy Chief of Chaplains, Air Force Chief of Chaplaincy Services, Washington, D.C., 1996.

than among Marine Corps enlisted personnel (29.2 percent).

The “No Religious Preference” category is largely under-represented in the officer categories of the services. This category is: 19 percentage points under-represented in the Army officer corps (8 percent) than among Army enlisted personnel (27 percent); 12.6 percentage points under-represented in the officer corps of the Navy (11 percent) than among Navy enlisted personnel (23.6 percent); and 9.3 percentage points under-represented in the officer corps of the Marine Corps (5.7 percent) than among Marine Corps enlisted personnel (15 percent). The “Unknown” category is relatively consistent between services with the exception of the Navy, where no records are kept for officers, and the Air Force, where there is an over-representation of 11.6 percentage points in the officer corps.

The data presented in Table 8 indicate that a larger proportion of the officer corps than the enlisted force, identify themselves as Christians. However, Table 7 shows that, despite the considerable percentage point differences, the enlisted force has a much larger number of persons identified as Christians. Additionally, the data show that the enlisted community has a far greater proportion and number of persons with no religious preference.

C. RELIGIOUS DEMOGRAPHICS OF AMERICAN SOCIETY

The broad religious demographics of American society are researched annually by the George Gallop Organization, based in Princeton, New Jersey. Gallop’s Princeton Religion Research Center conducts the research and publishes findings in a document

titled “Religion in America.” The number of religious preference alternatives identified in the Gallop study varies from year to year, but is generally smaller than the number used by the military.

During 1996, the Princeton Religion Research Center included the following categories in its study of religious preferences: Protestant, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and Judaism, based on gallop surveys conducted in 1994 and 1995. In a supplement to its 1995 publication, the organization also detailed the distribution of five Protestant denominations based on 1994 research. These denominations were the Southern Baptist Convention, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, and an “Other Baptist” category.¹¹³ The distribution of religious preferences within American society is presented in Table 9.

The answer to the third subsidiary question, whether the military reflects society in its religious composition, can be determined by comparing data in Tables 7 and 9. This comparison suggests that the Christian and Jewish faiths and the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints are under-represented in the active-duty military. Additionally, the data indicate that most Christian denominations are under-represented in the military.

With representation of 75.3 percent in the active-duty military, the Christian faith is 8.7 percentage points less than its level in the general population. Likewise, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the Jewish faith each represent 2 percent of the general population but only 1.1 percent and 0.4 percent, respectively, of the military.

The general category of “Protestant Christian” is under-represented in the active-duty

¹¹³ Princeton Religion Research Center, Religion in America, 1996, (Princeton, NJ: 1996).

Table 9. Percentage Distribution of the U.S. Population by Religious Preference, 1994-96

FAITH GROUP	Percent
Christian	84
- Protestant	58
-- Baptist	7
-- Lutheran	5
-- Methodist	8
-- Presbyterian	4
-- Southern Baptist Convention	9
- Roman Catholic	25
- Orthodox	1
Church of Jesus Christ of LDS	2
Jew	2
Other Religions/No Preference	12
TOTAL	100

Sources: Princeton Religion Research Center, Religion in America, 1996, Princeton, N.J., 1996; Princeton Religion Research Center, Religion in American, 1995 - Supplement, Princeton, N.J., 1995.

military, at a level of 50 percent, compared with 58 percent in society. Orthodox Christianity is likewise under-represented in the military, accounting for 0.1 percent of the active-duty force and 1 percent of society. The Roman Catholic Church has a similar proportional representation in both the military (25.2 percent) and in society (25 percent).

The Baptist Church is the only denomination that is over-represented in the military.

When the Southern Baptist Convention and the “Other Baptist Church” categories are combined, the Baptist Church represents 22.3 percent of the active-duty force, compared with 16 percent of society.

The Lutheran, Methodist, and Presbyterian Churches are all under-represented in the military. It is not possible to compare the representativeness of the Buddhist, Hindu, Jehovah’s Witness, or Muslim faiths, due to the methodology utilized by the Princeton Religion Research Center in gathering its information.

The “No Religious Preference” category is not clearly defined by the Princeton Religion Research Center, as it includes the category defined as “Other Religions” by the military in Table 7. However, Table 9 suggests that there are nearly twice as many military personnel as persons in the general population who claim to have no religious preference. The military records 21.9 percent of its personnel in the “No Religious Preference” category, while Table 9 suggests that 12 percent of society fall into this category.

In summary, and in answer to the third subsidiary question, the active-duty military is under-represented with respect to virtually all religions when compared with society. The Christian faith is 8.7 percentage points less in its level in the military than in society. Other groups, including the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the Jewish faith, are 0.9 percentage points, respectively, and 1.6 percentage points under-represented in the military. Proportionately, about twice as many military personnel as persons in the general population belong to the category of “No Religious Preference.”

D. CHRISTIAN DENOMINATIONAL DOCTRINES

The fourth subsidiary question seeks to establish the doctrines of the major religions and Christian denominations represented in the military with regard to the issue of homosexuality. As observed in Section B, the only major faith group represented in significant numbers (more than 2 percent) is the Christian faith.

The largest Christian denominations represented in the military are the Roman Catholic Church, Southern Baptist Convention, American Baptist Church, General Association of General Baptists, National Baptist Church, United Methodist Church, and Evangelical Lutheran Church in America. The positions and doctrines documented in this paper represent the teachings of these denominations and, by extension, the assumed beliefs of the majority of military personnel holding religious preferences.

Table 7 shows that the “Protestant, Other” category includes 15.5 percent of the active-duty force. The views of personnel in this category are not documented in this thesis. Additionally, the procedure of grouping denominations into “like” categories and then selecting the largest denomination of each grouping as the “representative” denomination fails to incorporate different denominational teachings within each grouping. It would be erroneous to suggest that the doctrines discussed here represent the teachings of the entire Christian church. However, these doctrines do represent the teachings of the largest Christian denominations in the military and in American society.

Of the seven endorsing agents contacted, six responded to questions related to denominational teachings on homosexuality and potential integration of homosexuals into the military. Endorsing agent responses provide an answer to the fourth subsidiary

question, and are listed in order of denominational representation in the active-duty force.

1. Roman Catholic Church

The largest denomination in the active-duty military is the Roman Catholic Church, accounting for 25.2 percent of force. As a denomination, the Roman Catholic Church has been one of the most deliberate in ensuring that its military chaplains fully understand the denomination's teaching with regard to the potential integration of homosexuals into the military. The Roman Catholic Church has also sought to influence national policy, through a letter to the President of the United States.

The official teachings of the Roman Catholic Church are primarily documented in two sources: the Catechism of the Catholic Church and a policy statement issued by the Military Ordinary Archbishop, Joseph T. Dimino, in 1993. The Catechism of the Catholic Church is a document that details Catholic policy to the world body of the Roman Catholic Church. After defining the meaning of homosexuality as "relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex,"¹¹⁴ the Catechism addresses the issue of homosexuality in three broad ways.

First, the Catechism offers the teaching that homosexual acts are sinful, based on the teachings of the "Sacred Scriptures, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity (Genesis 19:1-29, Romans 1:24-27, 1 Corinthians 6:10 and 1 Timothy 1:10)." It then goes on to describe homosexual acts as: "intrinsically disordered," "contrary to the

¹¹⁴ Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, (New York: Doubleday, 1994), Part Three, Article 6, Section II, Paragraph 2357.

natural law,” “clos[ing] the sexual act to the gift of life,” and “not proceed[ing] from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity.” Further, the Catechism states that “under no circumstances can they [homosexual acts] be approved.”¹¹⁵

Second, the Catechism states that the number of persons with “deep-seated homosexual tendencies” is not negligible and that they are to be “accepted with respect, compassion and sensitivity.” The Catechism states that “every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided.”¹¹⁶

The third teaching presented by the Catechism is that homosexuals “are called to chastity.” It states that chastity should be pursued by “self-mastery” and supported by “fellowship, prayer and sacramental grace.”¹¹⁷ The Catechism of the Catholic Church is presented in its entirety in appendix E.

Archbishop Dimino provided the official position of the Catholic Archdiocese for the Military Services USA in 1993 when he issued a policy statement to all Catholic chaplains with regard to homosexual integration into the U.S. military. His statement expanded on a letter he had sent to President Clinton, after the President had expressed his intention to remove the military’s ban on homosexuals. In his letter, Archbishop Dimino urged the President to maintain the military’s policy of excluding homosexuals from military service. Part of the letter reads as follows:

... I urge you to heed the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to maintain the traditional

¹¹⁵ Ibid.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., Paragraph 2358.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., Paragraph 2359.

Defense Department policy concerning homosexuality. The acceptance of homosexuality as an appropriate alternate life style for the military will in my judgment have disastrous consequences for all concerned.¹¹⁸

In his 1993 policy statement, Archbishop Dimino expounded upon the teachings presented in the Catechism. He reiterated the Roman Catholic Church's opposition to the admission of homosexuals into the military.¹¹⁹ He further restated the first element of the Catechism, that homosexual activities are sinful.¹²⁰ The policy statement reiterated the Catholic Church teaching that homosexual orientation is, in itself, not sinful; but, that homosexual activities are sinful, and homosexual orientation may not be used as a reason to justify homosexual activity.¹²¹

The statement also explained that the Catholic Church's opposition to homosexual integration within the military is largely on a concern for the advancement of the "individual good." The "individual good" was defined as "the moral and spiritual welfare of the individual person, namely, the right and concomitant obligation of every individual to strive to live virtuously in pursuit of eternal happiness."¹²² Archbishop Dimino's statement acknowledged that, while many arguments opposing homosexual integration into the military are based on a desire to preserve the "common good," this is not the

¹¹⁸ Dimino, to Clinton.

¹¹⁹ Dimino, Joseph T., to Military Chaplains of the Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., April 16, 1993, Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Silver Spring, Maryland, Paragraph 1.

¹²⁰ Ibid., Paragraph 11.

¹²¹ Ibid.

¹²² Ibid., Paragraph 8.

source of the primary opposition from the Catholic Church.¹²³

Archbishop Dimino expanded on the second element contained in the Catechism by stressing the obligation of all chaplains to treat people seeking assistance, counseling, or advice on all matters, including homosexual issues, with “kindness, charity and with the highest degree of confidentiality.”¹²⁴ He went on to state that the Catholic Church does not consider the exclusion of homosexuals from the military to be a form of “unjust discrimination” (which the Catechism expressly forbids).¹²⁵ He referred to a statement made at the 1992 Vatican Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith, which indicated that:

There are areas in which it is not unjust discrimination to take sexual orientation into account, for example, in the placement of children for adoption or foster care, in the employment of teachers and coaches and in military recruitment.¹²⁶

Addressing the third element of the Catechism, Archbishop Dimino stressed the requirement for homosexuals to be chaste by stating that:

The Catholic Church teaches that the virtue of chastity is to be practiced both by those who are married and by those who are single. Neither heterosexual activity outside of marriage nor homosexual activity under any circumstances is ever morally permissible. Both are against the law of God and His Church.¹²⁷

Archbishop Dimino’s policy statement is presented in its entirety in Appendix F.

¹²³ In Paragraph 6, Archbishop Dimino defines the “common good” as the maintenance of military discipline and esprit de corps, as well as the impact that homosexually orientated persons in the military would have on service recruiting efforts.

¹²⁴ Dimino, to Military Chaplains of the Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Paragraph 5.

¹²⁵ Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, Paragraph 2358.

¹²⁶ Roman Catholic Church, “Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith,” Number 11, The Vatican, Rome, July 1992.

¹²⁷ Dimino, to Military Chaplains of the Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Paragraph 4.

Roman Catholic teaching can be summarized as follows:

- a. Homosexual activities, but not homosexual orientation, are sinful.

Homosexual behavior is not to be approved under any circumstances.

- b. Homosexuality should not be accepted as a lifestyle within the military.

c. Persons with homosexual tendencies should be treated by all with respect, compassion, and sensitivity. Unjust discrimination against homosexuals is to be avoided. The exclusion of homosexuals from military service is not an area of unjust discrimination.

- d. Persons with homosexual tendencies should be chaste.

2. Baptist Church

The second largest religious group in the U.S. military is the Baptist Church, which represents 22.3 percent of the active-duty force. This is a general category, consisting of 22 different Baptist denominations. As such, there is no specific “Baptist doctrine,” but rather numerous doctrines from the various denominations. The researcher has sought to determine the doctrines of the four largest Baptist denominations represented in the military. These denominations are the Southern Baptist Convention, American Baptist, General Baptist, and National Baptist Churches.

a. Southern Baptist Convention

The Southern Baptist Convention (Southern Baptist) is the only Baptist Church with more than 2 percent of the active-duty force identifying it as their religious preference. It is also the largest Baptist and Protestant denomination in American society.¹²⁸ Like the Roman Catholic Church, it has been active in the formulation and

¹²⁸ See Table 9.

documentation of official policy with regard to homosexuals and the military.

In 1993, representatives at the Southern Baptist Convention's annual meeting passed a resolution expressing their denomination's official position with regard to homosexuality, military service, and civil rights.¹²⁹ The resolution provides a detailed explanation of Southern Baptist doctrine with regard to homosexuality and the potential of homosexuals serving in the military.

The resolution has numerous parts. First, it presents the Southern Baptist Convention's teaching that homosexuality is sinful behavior. Homosexuality is described as "immoral, contrary to the Bible (Lev. 18:22, 1 Cor. 6:9-10) and contrary to traditional Judeo-Christian moral standards," and the open affirmation of homosexuality is considered "a sign of God's surrendering a society to its perversions (Rom. 1:18-31)."¹³⁰ The resolution goes on state that homosexuality is not an unforgivable sin, by referring to the Biblical statement that "all persons, including homosexuals, can receive abundant, new life by repenting of their sin and trusting Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord (1 Cor. 6:11)."¹³¹

The resolution states that the Southern Baptist Convention opposes the integration of homosexuals into the military. It states their opposition to lifting the ban and supports the passage of Congressional legislation to restore and enforce the ban.¹³² The resolution

¹²⁹ Southern Baptist Convention resolutions reflect the cooperative understanding of Southern Baptists.

¹³⁰ Southern Baptist Convention, "Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights," Southern Baptist Convention Annual Meeting, Houston, Texas, June 15-17, 1993.

¹³¹ Ibid.

¹³² Ibid.

lists a number of reasons for opposing homosexual integration, including the opinion of senior officers, military law, and the maintenance of “good order and discipline.”

The resolution states the following with regard to the appropriateness of homosexuals serving in the military:

Whereas, Open and avowed homosexuality is incompatible with the requirements of military service according to high ranking military officers and most military personnel; and

Whereas, homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the Uniform Code of Military Justice and is detrimental to morale, unit cohesion, good order, discipline, and mission accomplishment; and

Whereas, Homosexuality in the military would endanger the life and health of military personnel by the increased exposure to sexually transmitted diseases and by enhanced danger of tainted blood in battlefield conditions; and

Whereas, Open homosexuality in the military would have significant adverse impact on the Pentagon’s budget including medical, legal and social costs; and

Whereas, Southern Baptist and other evangelical military chaplains may be pressured to compromise the essential gospel message, withhold their biblical convictions about this sexual perversion and submit to “sensitivity training” concerning homosexuality if openly declared homosexuals are permitted to serve; and

Whereas, Southern Baptists and other evangelical members of the armed forces will be placed in compromising environments which will violate their conscience if the ban is lifted and will discourage other potential evangelical recruits from serving in the armed forces. . . .¹³³

The Southern Baptist Convention teaches that homosexual politics “have nothing in common with the moral [civil rights] movement to stop discrimination against race and gender”; and that the government “should not give special legal protection and endorsement to homosexuality, nor impose legal sanctions against those who believe homosexual conduct to be immoral.” Additionally, it “deplore[s] acts of hatred or violence committed by homosexuals against those who take a stand for traditional morality as well as acts of hatred or violence committed against homosexuals.”¹³⁴

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

Southern Baptist Convention teaching can be summarized as follows:

(1) Homosexuality is immoral and contrary to traditional Judeo-Christian moral standards. It is a forgivable sin, and abundant, new, and eternal life is available to all who repent of homosexuality.

(2) Open affirmation of homosexuality represents a sign of God's surrendering a society to its perversions.

(3) Open and avowed homosexuality is incompatible with the requirements of military service, homosexuals should be excluded from the military.

(4) Homosexual politics are not a civil rights issue, and homosexuals should not be afforded special legal protection by the government.

(5) Acts of hatred or violence by or against homosexuals are unacceptable.

The Southern Baptist Convention resolution is reproduced in its entirety in Appendix G.

b. American Baptist Church

The American Baptist Church has produced less official documentation on the issue of homosexuality than have the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. It has no official policy on the issue of homosexual integration into the military.

The national body of the American Baptist Church has passed two resolutions and one statement of concern that are relevant to the issue of homosexuality. The definitions of a resolution and a statement of concern are critical to an accurate understanding of American Baptist doctrine. A resolution is church doctrine, whereas, a statement of

concern is an expression of the opinion of delegates at a biannual meeting. A statement of concern does not have to be based on or be in agreement with an American Baptist policy statement or resolution. As such, a statement of concern does not represent official church policy, but it is often used to support or challenge American Baptist policy statements and resolutions.¹³⁵

The delegates at the American Baptist biannual meeting in 1991 passed the strongest statement made by this church with regard to homosexuality, when they stated opposition to the homosexual lifestyle and attempts to legitimize it. An extract of the statement reads as follows:

We do not accept the homosexual lifestyle, homosexual marriage, ordination of homosexual clergy or establishment of “gay churches” or “gay caucuses.”
We do not accept any exhibitors into American Baptist meetings who attempt to legitimize the homosexual lifestyle.
Therefore, we affirm that the Church should love and minister to the homosexual, but condemn the sin of the practice of homosexuality.¹³⁶

At the conclusion of this statement, the members called upon the General Board of the American Baptist Church to adopt it as a resolution. Twelve months later, in October 1992, the American Baptist Church passed a resolution stating, “we affirm that the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching.”¹³⁷

The 1992 resolution is the most authoritative policy statement issued by the

¹³⁵ Mitchel, Thelma, American Baptist Churches U.S.A., to Peterson, Mike, January 10, 1997, Monterey, California.

¹³⁶ American Baptist Church, “Statement of Concern - Addressing Homosexuality and the Church,” American Baptist Church Biennial Meeting, 1991.

¹³⁷ American Baptist Church, “American Baptist Resolution on Homosexuality,” General Board Reference # - 8200:10/92, October 1992.

American Baptist Church on the topic of homosexuality, but it provides no official guidance concerning most of the issues raised by the delegates in 1991. The issue of homosexuality and the necessity for official church policy with regard to homosexuality, has become a matter of internal debate within the American Baptist Church.¹³⁸

The American Baptist Church has a strong policy of opposition to manifestations of prejudice against persons because of their ethnicity, race, religion, or sexual orientation.

In June 1989, a resolution was adopted that stated:

We declare, as American Baptists, our opposition to manifestations of prejudices against persons because of their ethnic origin or race and persons because of their religion or sexual orientation regardless of our approval or disapproval of that orientation.¹³⁹

Within the teaching of these two resolutions, members of the American Baptist Church have been unable to reach a consensus concerning the guiding principle for further church policy on homosexuality. Some feel that policy should be guided by strong opposition to all manifestations of prejudice, including homosexuality, while others believe policy should be an extension of the 1991 statement of concern.¹⁴⁰ One thing is clear: the National Board of the American Baptist Church is not close to resolving this issue.

Although the American Baptist Church continues to wrestle with additional policy toward homosexuality, its current teachings can be summarized as follows:

- (1) Homosexual behavior is incompatible with Christian teaching.

¹³⁸ Mitchel, Thelma, "American Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality," Telephone Interview with Ms. Thelma Mitchel, February 14, 1997.

¹³⁹ American Baptist Church, "American Baptist Resolution Against Manifestations of Prejudice," General Board Reference # 8175:12/88, June 1989, Modified September 1992.

¹⁴⁰ Mitchel, "American Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality."

(2) Prejudice against homosexuals, regardless of approval or disapproval of that orientation, is wrong.

c. General Association of General Baptists

Like the American Baptist Church, the General Association of General Baptists (General Baptists) has not issued a policy statement regarding the potential integration of homosexuals into the military. Further, this topic has not been formally addressed at any of the denomination's annual conferences.¹⁴¹ The General Baptists have, however, issued a number of statements regarding homosexuality.

In its publication titled "The Social Principles of General Baptists," General Baptists teach that homosexual behavior is deviant, evil, and incompatible with Christian teaching. An extract of the document states:

We abhor the practice of homosexuality and consider this practice to be a growing deviance, incompatible with Christian teaching. In view of the efforts by the "*gay movement*" to gain political power and general acceptance by the public, the church must be diligent to keep this evil under control in our society. In all areas of sexual behavior, the Church must be prepared and ready to give guidance to the deviant persons who have fallen into immoral practices in their struggle for human fulfillment. Reconciling relationships with God is the only road to freedom of soul and spirit.¹⁴²

Further, on the subject of human sexuality and marriage, the denomination teaches that sexual relations should be practiced only within the marriage bond of one man and one woman, thus rejecting "marriages" between persons of the same sex. The General Baptists also make specific reference to a requirement of chastity outside of marriage.

¹⁴¹ Chapman, Dwight, "General Association of General Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality," Telephone Interview with Mr. Dwight Chapman, February 14, 1997.

¹⁴² General Association of General Baptists, "The Social Principles of General Baptists," Section II, Paragraph F.

Their teachings state that:

We recognize that sexuality is a gift of God which, in all instances, is to be disciplined in such a manner as to bring two persons to its true fulfillment. We are to be good stewards of this divine gift. We believe that society as a whole has fallen far below God's standards of sexual morality. We believe the Bible teaches that sexual relations should be practiced only within the marriage bond. We oppose premarital and extramarital sex. Sex may become exploitative within as well as outside marriage. Therefore, Christians must take care to insure that deep affection and respect be maintained in all marriage relationships. We believe in the divine sanctity of the marriage covenant between a man and a woman. This is God's plan for a continued decent, civilized society. We reject a "marriage" between two persons of the same sex and count such an act in violation of God's ordained plans for human beings. . . .¹⁴³

The most recent teachings of the denomination were discussed at its 1996 Annual Conference, when a statement was made rejecting the argument that homosexuals are a minority group deserving special protection. This was included in a report of the General Baptists' Social Issues Commission and stated that:

We deplore the Supreme Court decision over turning [sic] Colorado Amendment 2 and affirm that Homosexuals are not, like racial-groups, a minority deserving of special protections beyond the protections afforded all citizens. . . .¹⁴⁴

The report went on to state that "the Christian response to homosexual behavior must be to hate the sin, but love and minister to the sinner."¹⁴⁵

Official teachings of the General Association of General Baptists can be summarized as follows:

(1) Homosexuality is sinful and homosexual "marriage" is incompatible with

¹⁴³ General Association of General Baptists, Paragraphs B and E.

¹⁴⁴ General Association of General Baptists, "Proceedings and Reports of the 127th Annual Session of the General Association of General Baptists," July 16-18, 1996, pp. 125-126.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., p.126.

God's plan for continued decent, civilized society.

(2) Sexual relationships are only acceptable within the marriage bond of man and woman.

(3) The Christian response to homosexual behavior should be "hate the sin but love the sinner," and be prepared to provide guidance to help establish reconciling relationships between homosexuals and God.

d. National Baptist Church

The endorsing agent of the National Baptist Church did not respond to requests for an explanation of the National Baptist Church's doctrine on the issue of potential homosexual integration within the military.

3. Methodist Church

The Methodist Church represents 4.9 percent of the active-duty military and consists of 10 different denominations. The largest denomination is the United Methodist Church. The United Methodist Church has not sought to influence national policy on the topic of homosexual integration into the military, and has produced no official policy statements detailing teachings on this matter.

The denomination has a number of writings, however, that deal with homosexuality, and these state that "the practice of homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching."¹⁴⁶ Denominational policy restricts homosexual involvement in the church by not allowing "self-avowed practicing" homosexuals to be accepted as "candidates,

¹⁴⁶ United Methodist Church, "Book of Discipline - 1996," 1996, p. 172.

ordained as ministers, or appointed to serve in the United Methodist Church.”¹⁴⁷ Further, with regard to marriage, denominational policy states that “ceremonies that celebrate homosexual unions shall not be conducted by our ministers and shall not be conducted in our churches.”¹⁴⁸

United Methodist Church policy goes on to place strong emphasis on equal rights, regardless of sexual orientation. It teaches that certain basic human rights and civil liberties are due to all people and states that:

We [the members of the United Methodist Church] are committed to supporting those rights and liberties for homosexual persons. We see a clear issue of simple justice in protecting their rightful claims where they have shared material resources, pensions, guardian relationships, mutual powers of attorney, and other such lawful claims typically attendant to contractual relationships that involve shared contributions, responsibilities, and liabilities, and equal protection before the law.¹⁴⁹

Further, it goes on to state that “we support efforts to stop violence and other forms of coercion against gays and lesbians. We also commit ourselves to social witness against the coercion and marginalization of former homosexuals.”¹⁵⁰

United Methodist Church policy states that “homosexual persons no less than heterosexual persons are individuals of sacred worth”; and that, while the church does not “condone the practice of homosexuality and consider[s] this practice incompatible with Christian teaching,” it teaches that “God’s grace is available to all.”¹⁵¹ The United

¹⁴⁷ Ibid.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 87.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 94.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., p. 89.

Methodist Church is committed to ministering to all persons, both heterosexual and homosexual.

The United Methodist Church has no specific doctrine or teaching concerning the possible acceptance of homosexuals in the military. The endorsing agent stated, however, that based on the degree to which the church affirms basic human rights and civil liberties, it appears that the church “would have no objection to homosexual persons serving within the armed forces.”¹⁵² This, while not official church policy, may be the most likely response from this denomination to the issue of homosexual integration into the military.

United Methodist teaching can be summarized as follows:

- a. The practice of homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching.
- b. Homosexuals should not fill official positions within the denomination, and ceremonies that celebrate homosexual unions should not be conducted in church facilities or by their ministers.
- c. The rights and liberties of homosexuals should be protected, and there should be an end to violence and other forms of coercion against homosexuals.
- d. In affirming the rights and liberties of homosexuals, it appears that this denomination does not object to homosexuals serving in the military.

4. Lutheran Church

The Lutheran Church accounts for 3.5 percent of the active-duty force and is the smallest of the four Christian denominational categories researched. It consists of eight

¹⁵² Townsend, James E., United Methodist Church, to Peterson, Mike, January 14, 1997, Monterey, California.

denominations, the largest of which is the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Like the majority of denominations researched, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has not published any formal policy statement regarding service by homosexuals in the military. Its members, in a similar way to those of the American Baptist Church, are presently attempting to establish a consensus regarding their official denominational teaching on homosexuality. The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has experienced a considerable amount of debate and controversy for more than two years and it is attempting to conclude a number of “unresolved issues surrounding homosexuality.”¹⁵³

In March 1996, the Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America sent a letter to church members in an effort to strengthen church unity. The letter’s primary purpose was to encourage the denomination’s homosexual members at a time when the denomination as a whole was experiencing “sharp disagreements,” and a number of denominational debates had “turned bitter” on the topic of homosexuality.¹⁵⁴

The letter reminded members of a declaration passed at the 1991 assembly, which declared “gay and lesbian people, as individuals created by God, are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.”¹⁵⁵ Additionally, it referred to a declaration passed at the 1993 assembly that

¹⁵³ Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, March 22, 1996, Chicago, Illinois.

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

expressed “strong opposition to all forms of verbal or physical harassment or assault of persons because of their sexual orientation,”¹⁵⁶ and “support for the civil rights of all persons, regardless of their sexual orientation.”¹⁵⁷ The letter went on to state that:

We repudiate all words and acts of hatred toward gay and lesbian persons in our congregation and in our communities, and extend a caring welcome for gay and lesbian persons and their families. We call upon all our pastors, as they exercise pastoral care, to be sensitive to the gifts and needs of gay and lesbian members. We urge our congregations to reach out to all God’s people with the Gospel of Jesus Christ.¹⁵⁸

The letter drew heavily on the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America’s teaching that homosexuals are “often the special and undeserving victims of prejudice and discrimination in law, law enforcement, cultural mores, and congregational life.”¹⁵⁹

Other published policy teaches that the practice of homosexuality is “contrary to God’s intent for his children” and that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America “rejects the contention that homosexual behavior is simply another form of sexual behavior equally valid with the dominant male/female pattern.”¹⁶⁰ Denominational policy goes on to differentiate between homosexual orientation and homosexual behavior. It teaches that “persons who do not practice their homosexual erotic preference do not

¹⁵⁶ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “Action of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America,” Adopted by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, March 27-29, 1993.

¹⁵⁷ Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “Sex, Marriage, and Family,” Adopted by the Fifth Biennial Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 25 - July 2, 1970, p. 4.

¹⁶⁰ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “Human Sexuality and Sexual Behavior,” Adopted by the Tenth General Convention of the American Lutheran Church (GC80.4.43), October 1980, p. 8.

violate our understanding of Christian sexual behavior.”¹⁶¹ With regard to marriage, official teaching states that: “Scripture sets the standard of a lifelong monogamous marriage of one man and one woman”,¹⁶² “sexual intercourse should be an expression of the love of husband and wife”,¹⁶³ and “sexual intercourse outside the context of the marriage union is morally wrong.”¹⁶⁴

While the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America opposes homosexual behavior, it does not elevate it above other sins such as “idolatry, pride, disrespect for parents, murder, adultery, theft, libel, gossip, or the other sins known in our circles.”¹⁶⁵

Published teachings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America regarding homosexuality can be summarized as follows:

- a. Homosexuality is contrary to God’s intent. Homosexual behavior should not be viewed as another form of sexual behavior equally valid with the dominant male/female pattern.
- b. Homosexual behavior should not be elevated above other sins such as idolatry, pride, disrespect for parents, murder, adultery, theft, libel, or gossip.
- c. Homosexuals are welcome to participate fully in the life of the congregations of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Ibid., p. 5.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

¹⁶⁴ Lutheran Church in America, “Sex, Marriage, and Family,” p. 3.

¹⁶⁵ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “Human Sexuality and Sexual Behavior,” pp. 8-9.

d. There should be no verbal or physical harassment or assault of persons because of their sexual orientation; and the civil rights of all persons, regardless of their sexual orientation should be protected.

The Evangelical Lutheran Church in America has not reached a final resolution with regard to its official teaching on homosexuality. Current teachings and denominational practices are under review, with further discussion planned for the Churchwide Assembly in 1997.¹⁶⁶

5. Summary of Denominational Doctrines

The six denominations that responded to the researcher's questions did so in a variety of ways. Most sent copies of official writings on homosexuality and associated topics, such as sexuality and marriage. The two denominations that had developed official policy statements regarding homosexuals in the military forwarded copies of their policies to the researcher.

The endorsing agent of the United Methodist Church was the only one to answer all questions asked by the researcher. Members of the General Association of General Baptists have never formally discussed the topic of homosexuals in the military.¹⁶⁷ Members of the American Baptist Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are involved in internal discussions, seeking to clarify their official denominational teaching on the topic of homosexuality.

The beliefs of the six respondent denominations can be summarized as follows:

¹⁶⁶ Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

¹⁶⁷ Chapman, "General Association of General Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality."

a. All denominations teach that the practice of homosexual behavior is incompatible with Christian teaching. Official writings describe homosexuality in a variety of ways, including: “acts of grave depravity”,¹⁶⁸ “sinful”,¹⁶⁹ “immoral, contrary to the Bible (Lev. 18:22, 1 Cor. 6:9-10) and contrary to traditional Judeo-Christian moral standards”,¹⁷⁰ “incompatible with Christian teaching”,¹⁷¹ “a growing deviance”,¹⁷² “evil”,¹⁷³ and “contrary to God’s intent for his children.”¹⁷⁴

b. All denominations teach that homosexuality is one of many sins. They teach that homosexuals may be forgiven by “repenting of their sin and trusting Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.”¹⁷⁵ Further, they teach that Christians should “love and minister to the homosexual, but condemn the sin of the practice of homosexuality.”¹⁷⁶

c. All denominations teach that homosexuals should be regarded with “respect,

¹⁶⁸ Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, Paragraph 2357.

¹⁶⁹ Dimino, to Military Chaplains of the Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Paragraph 11.

¹⁷⁰ Southern Baptist Convention, “Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights.”

¹⁷¹ American Baptist Church, “American Baptist Resolution on Homosexuality”; United Methodist Church, “Book of Resolutions - 1992”; General Association of General Baptists, “The Social Principles of General Baptists.”

¹⁷² General Association of General Baptists, “The Social Principles of General Baptists.”

¹⁷³ Ibid.

¹⁷⁴ Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, “Human Sexuality and Sexual Behavior,” p. 8.

¹⁷⁵ Southern Baptist Convention, “Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights.”

¹⁷⁶ American Baptist Church, “Statement of Concern - Addressing Homosexuality and the Church.”

compassion and sensitivity.”¹⁷⁷

d. All denominations oppose acts of hatred or violence against or by homosexuals.

e. Most denominations state formal opposition to unjust discrimination or prejudice against homosexuals in their policy statements. However, the definition of what constitutes “unjust discrimination” varies between denominations. The American Baptist Church, United Methodist Church and Evangelical Lutheran Church in America place particular emphasis on opposing discrimination against homosexuals.

f. The Roman Catholic Church, the General Association of General Baptists, and Evangelical Lutheran Church of America call for persons with homosexual tendencies--and all persons outside of a one man, one woman marriage relationship--to remain chaste.

g. The Roman Catholic Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America teach that homosexual orientation is not sinful.

h. The Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention, the only denominations to publish a policy on homosexuals in the military, strongly oppose any policy that would remove the military’s ban on homosexuals.

i. Despite having published no official policy, the United Methodist Church most likely has no objection to homosexuals serving in the military.

j. The United Methodist Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America are committed to supporting the civil rights of homosexuals.

k. The Southern Baptist Convention firmly opposes any link between homosexual

¹⁷⁷ Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, Paragraph 2358.

politics and civil rights.

Denominational responses can be further summarized into three distinct categories. The categories comprise denominations who support, oppose or have not declared their position regarding homosexual integration into the military.

First, there is a category that consists of a number of denominations who officially oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military. This category includes the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. These are the two largest denominations in the military and American society, accounting for at least 27.2 percent of the military and 34 percent of society.¹⁷⁸ Based on the size of this category, it is termed the “Majority” Christian position.

These denominations base their teaching on Biblical references stating that homosexual acts are in violation of God’s standards. Biblical references, as stated in official documents, include Genesis 19:1-29, Leviticus 18:22, Romans 1:24-27, 1 Corinthians 6:9-10 and 1 Timothy 1:10. These references provide the command “do not lie with a man as one lies with a woman: that is detestable,”¹⁷⁹ and go on to warn:

Do you not know that the wicked will not inherit the kingdom of God? Do not be deceived: neither the sexually immoral nor idolaters nor adulterers nor male prostitutes nor homosexual offenders nor thieves nor the greedy nor drunkards nor slanderers nor swindlers will inherit the kingdom of God.¹⁸⁰

Further, they oppose efforts to openly affirm homosexuality, as they consider this to

¹⁷⁸ See Tables 7 and 9. A more exact military figure is not able to be determined due to the way the services record Baptist denominations.

¹⁷⁹ Leviticus 18:22.

¹⁸⁰ 1 Corinthians 6:9-10.

represent “a sign of God’s surrendering a society to its perversions (Rom. 1:18-31).”¹⁸¹

This reasoning, accompanied by belief that homosexuality is incompatible with the requirements of service life, leads these denominations to categorically oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military.

These denominations do not consider the exclusion of homosexuals from the military to be a form of unjust discrimination, based on these Biblical teachings and the unique requirements associated with military life. Further, they consider their position regarding homosexuality to be one way of loving homosexuals by warning the unrepentant homosexual that, based on 1 Corinthians 6:9-10, he or she will not inherit the kingdom of God. Their doctrines state that “abundant, new and eternal life” is obtainable for the homosexual “by repenting of their sin and trusting Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord.”¹⁸²

While opposing the integration of homosexuals into the military, these denominations teach that Christians have the responsibility to “hate the sin but love the sinner.” Christians, and especially Christian ministers, are responsible for ministering to all persons, including homosexuals, with compassion and sensitivity.¹⁸³

Second, there is a category that, while stating that homosexuality is incompatible with Christian teaching, places strong emphasis on the equal rights of all persons, regardless of sexual orientation. This category is committed to ensuring basic human rights and civil

¹⁸¹ Southern Baptist Convention, “Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights.”

¹⁸² Ibid.

¹⁸³ Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, Paragraph 2358.

liberties are available to all persons. Although not stated in any official policy document, it appears that denominations belonging to this category would consider the exclusion of homosexuals from military service to be a violation of basic human rights.

This position is most strongly expressed in the United Methodist Church, which represents less than 4.9 percent of the military and less than 8 percent of society.¹⁸⁴ This position is termed the “Minority A” Christian position.

Third, there are a number of denominations who have not stated their official position regarding the issue of homosexual integration into the military. This category includes the American Baptist Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America who are seeking to clarify their teaching with regard to homosexuality, and the General Association of General Baptists who have clear teachings on homosexuality but have not developed policies on homosexuals in the military.

These denominations represent a relatively small portion of the military and society when compared to the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. The American Baptist Church and the General Association of General Baptists do not record individual percentage representations in either the military or society and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in American represents less than 3.5 percent of the military and less than 5 percent of society.¹⁸⁵ As a consequence, this category is termed the “Minority B” Christian position.

¹⁸⁴ The Methodist Church represents 4.9 percent of the military and 8 percent of society. It is made up of 10 denominations in the military and at least 10 denominations in society.

¹⁸⁵ See Tables 7 and 9. The Lutheran Church represents 3.5 percent of the military and 5 percent of society. It is made up of eight denominations in the military and at least eight denominations in society.

E. SERVICE PERSONNEL SURVEYS

Since President Clinton's decision to review the military's policy of excluding homosexuals from military service, numerous surveys have been conducted in efforts to determine the personal views of service members toward homosexual integration. Three surveys were conducted during the period from late 1992 to early 1993. The results of these surveys are discussed below.

The findings of the surveys suggest an answer to the primary research question of this thesis, which seeks to determine if the religious beliefs of military members influence personal responses to policies involving morality--specifically with regard to the 1993 proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military.

1. Army Survey

During the period from December 1992 to June 1993, Dr. Laura Miller, a sociologist and researcher at Harvard University, conducted research into the attitudes of Army personnel to various issues, including homosexuals in the military. As a part of this research, she surveyed 946 soldiers in December 1992 and 515 soldiers in June 1993.

Her survey included a significant over-sampling of female soldiers. At the time of the survey, women comprised 12 percent of the Army's total strength, yet represented 50 percent of personnel surveyed in December 1992 and 19 percent in June 1993. Miller deliberately over-sampled women because of a significant number of gender-related questions in her survey.¹⁸⁶ Survey questions relevant to this research and the soldier's

¹⁸⁶ Miller, Laura L., "Fighting for a Just Cause: Soldier's Views on Gays in the Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 70.

responses are included in Table 10.

Miller's survey results suggest that members of the Army are strongly opposed to the integration of homosexuals within the military. Of the male soldiers interviewed, 75 percent strongly disagreed or disagreed with the proposal to allow homosexuals into the military, while those who agreed or strongly agreed accounted for 16 percent. Female soldiers were evenly divided between those opposing and those supporting the proposal, with 43 percent in both categories.

Miller's survey asked a series of questions that provide insight into the reasons for opposition from soldiers to homosexual integration. Of particular interest to this research are two questions that were phrased in a manner consistent with Christian teaching.

First, soldiers were asked if they considered homosexuality to be abnormal and perverted; and second, they were asked if they considered homosexuality a sin. Miller's survey results show that 73 percent of male soldiers and 44 percent of female soldiers felt that homosexuality was abnormal and perverted. Further, 62 percent of male soldiers and 55 percent of female soldiers agreed that homosexuality is a sin.

On the issue of "sin," it is interesting to note that the proportion of positive responses is less than the 72.1 percent of the Army who were identified as Christian (see Table 1). On the other hand, when one considers that 88 percent of the Army was male in 1993, and that 73 percent of male respondents stated that homosexuality is abnormal and perverted, the survey response to this question is reflective of the portion of Army personnel who identify themselves as Christian.

When linked to the finding that a majority of soldiers oppose homosexual integration

Table 10. Attitudes of U.S. Army Personnel Concerning Potential Homosexual Integration, 1992-93

Response Rate (Percent)						
Question/Statement	Male Strongly Agree or Agree	Male Not Sure	Male Strongly Disagree or Disagree	Female Strongly Agree or Agree	Female Not Sure	Female Strongly Disagree or Disagree
How do you feel about the proposal that gays and lesbians should be allowed to enter and remain in the military?	16	8	75	43	13	43
Homosexuality is abnormal and perverted.	73	10	17	44	13	43
Homosexuality is a sin.	62	17	21	55	17	28
What people do in their private sex lives is no business of mine.	78	3	18	88	2	10
I would feel uncomfortable if there were some homosexuals in my unit.	75	5	20	35	7	58
I would feel uncomfortable having to share my room with a homosexual.	90	3	8	62	6	32
If gays were allowed in the military, I would be more hesitant to help a wounded soldier because I would be more afraid of getting AIDS.	59	9	33	42	10	48
We need sensitivity courses on accepting gays and lesbians in the Army.	24	10	66	48	9	43

Source: Data provided by Laura L. Miller, "U.S. Military Surveys," (1992-93), Harvard University, January 16, 1997.

into the military, these responses suggest that a majority of Army personnel hold understandings of homosexuality that are consistent with the “Majority” Christian position. That is, homosexuality is immoral, perverted and sinful; it is not compatible with the requirements of service life; and homosexuals should not be permitted to serve in the military. This suggests that the teachings of the “Majority” Christian denominations may have influenced the personal attitudes of soldiers with regard to the potential integration of homosexuals into the military.

Miller’s survey went on to identify other areas of opposition to homosexuals being admitted into the military. The results indicate that the vast majority of male soldiers (90 percent) and a majority of female soldiers (62 percent) would be uncomfortable sharing a room with a homosexual. When asked if they would be uncomfortable having homosexuals in their unit, 75 percent of men and 35 percent of women strongly agreed or agreed. The majority of women, 58 percent, indicated that they would not be uncomfortable having homosexuals in their unit.

The survey identified strong feelings of tolerance toward individual behavior outside the military environment, with the vast majority of both men (78 percent) and women (88 percent) indicating that the private lives of people are their own business. On the issue of sensitivity training, the majority of men stated that there is no need for such training, while 48 percent of women supported, and 43 percent opposed, sensitivity training.

Miller’s survey results suggest the following:

- a. The majority of Army personnel oppose homosexual integration into the military.

b. The majority of Army personnel view homosexuality in a way that is similar to Christian teaching, namely “perverted, immoral and sinful.”

c. The portion of soldiers who view homosexuality in a way similar to Christian teaching is reflective of the portion who identify themselves as Christian.

2. Air Force Survey

The Air Force conducted an extensive series of telephone interviews of approximately 800 Air Force personnel in January 1993. The Air Force survey has been referred to in published writings, including Miller’s article, “Fighting for a Just Cause: Soldiers’ Views on Gays in the Military.”¹⁸⁷ However, as of March 1997, it has not been made available to the general public.

In her article, Miller refers to a question from the Air Force survey that sought to determine the attitude of Air Force personnel to the military’s policy on homosexuals (which at that time involved separating known homosexuals and discharging people who stated that they were homosexuals). To this question, 67 percent of men and 43 percent of women stated that they agreed with the policy. Those who disagreed with the policy accounted for 19 percent of the male respondents and 32 percent of women. About 14 percent of men and 25 percent of women indicated that they were undecided.¹⁸⁸

The survey was conducted without the approval of the Secretary of the Air Force, and this is the reason given for the continued protection of its findings. According to Miller, the Air Force survey shows that there are strong objections among serving military

¹⁸⁷ Ibid., pp. 70-71.

¹⁸⁸ Ibid., p. 70.

personnel to the integration of homosexuals into the military.¹⁸⁹ This finding is consistent with the “Majority” Christian teaching that homosexuals should not serve in the military. Without access to the Air Force’s survey, however, it is not possible to develop any conclusions with regard to the reasons for this opposition.

3. Active-Duty Force Survey

The Los Angeles Times conducted a survey of U.S. military personnel over the period 11-16 February 1993. In this survey, 2,346 enlisted men and women on active duty in the United States military were interviewed outside 38 military bases in the continental United States and in Hawaii.¹⁹⁰ The survey addressed a number of “quality of life” issues associated with military service, and included a number of questions relating to the potential integration of homosexuals into the military. Survey questions relevant to this research and service personnel responses are included in Table 11.

The Los Angeles Times survey suggests that active-duty personnel considered the possible lifting of the ban on homosexuals one of the most significant problems facing the U.S. military in 1993. When asked to list the top two problems facing the U.S. military, 48 percent of respondents identified the possible lifting of the ban on homosexuals. This was the second-most popular response, after troop cuts/downsizing with 52 percent, and well ahead of the third-most popular response of low morale, which recorded 29 percent.

The survey sought to establish the attitudes of active-duty personnel toward lifting the

¹⁸⁹ Ibid., p. 71.

¹⁹⁰ Los Angeles Times Poll, “Study # 307 - United States Military Survey,” February 11-16, 1993.

Table 11. Attitudes of U.S. Military Personnel Concerning Potential Homosexual Integration, 1993

Question	Response Rate (Percent)				
What are the two top priorities in the military today? Percent	Troop cuts / downsizing 52	Possible lifting of the ban on homosexuals 48	Low morale 29	Few opportunities for advancement 20	Other (9 categories) 33
How do you feel about lifting the ban on homosexuals? Percent	Approve strongly 4	Approve somewhat 14	Don't know 8	Disapprove somewhat 15	Disapprove strongly 59
If disapprove of lifting the ban: What are the two main reasons for your disapproval? Percent	Oppose sharing facilities / quarters 63	It is immoral 40	Contribute to the spread of AIDS 28	It is against my religious views 21	They are not reliable in a combat situation 15
If approve of lifting the ban: What are the two main reasons you approve of lifting the ban? Percent	It's discrimination to ban them 58	It's not important to me 23	Homosexuals are no different to heterosexuals 19	Homosexuals already in the military 2	Other 6
How worried are you personally about the possible impact of permitting homosexuals into the military? Percent	Very worried 36	Worried 32	Not too worried 18	Not worried at all 10	Don't know 4
Would you describe yourself as: Percent	Very religious 11	Somewhat religious 53	Not too religious 24	Not religious at all 9	Don't know 3

Source: Los Angeles Times Poll, "Study # 307 - United States Military Survey," as reported in the Los Angeles Times on February 28, 1993, and March 1, 1993.

ban on homosexuals. Consistent with the surveys conducted by Miller and the Air Force, the Los Angeles Times poll found that the vast majority of service personnel opposed lifting the ban. On a question asking for individual feelings on lifting the ban, 74 percent disapproved, 18 percent approved, and 8 percent didn't know.

The survey asked service members to indicate the two main reasons for their opposition to or support for lifting the ban. Of the 74 percent who disapproved of lifting the ban, 40 percent stated that homosexuality is immoral, and 21 percent felt that it is against their religious views.

These were the second-most and forth-most numerous responses to this question, and they suggest identification among active-duty personnel with religious values and teaching consistent with Christianity. The most numerous response was opposition to sharing facilities/quarters with homosexuals, which was selected by 63 percent of the respondents. Of the 18 percent who supported raising the ban, the dominant reason for doing so was that it is discriminatory to exclude homosexuals from military service.

The statement that homosexuality is "immoral" is consistent with Christian teaching; and this response, coupled with the statement that homosexuality is against personal "religious views," suggests that the teachings of the "Majority" denominations may have influenced the attitudes of military personnel. Further, the survey asked personnel if they considered themselves to be religious. To this question, 88 percent indicated some degree of religious belief (11 percent "very religious," 53 percent "somewhat religious," 24 percent "not too religious"), while 9 percent indicated they were "not religious" and 3 percent did not know.

This response reflects a proportion of the force that is larger than shown in Table 7, where about three-fourths of all active-duty personnel identified themselves as religious. Based on Table 7, where 75.3 percent of the active-duty force is identified as Christian, and 3 percent as either Atheist, Buddhist, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Hindu, Jehovah's Witness, Jew, Muslim or "Other Religions," it is clear that the vast majority of personnel who indicated that they were religious, would align themselves with the Christian faith.

The Los Angeles Times survey suggests the following:

- a. At the height of the 1993 controversy surrounding the potential integration of homosexuals into the military, members of the active-duty military considered this to be the second-most significant issue facing the U.S. military (after troop cuts/downsizing).
- b. The majority of active-duty personnel oppose lifting the ban on homosexuals.
- c. A significant portion of the personnel who oppose homosexual integration into the military state that homosexuality is immoral and against personal religious views.
- d. Military members consider themselves to be "religious," even though a number claim to have no religious preference.

4. Summary of Service Personnel Surveys

The Army, Air Force, and active-duty surveys have corresponding results on at least two points. First, they support the conclusion that a majority of active-duty personnel oppose allowing homosexuals to serve openly in the military. Miller's Army survey found that 75 percent of male soldiers and 43 percent of female soldiers oppose homosexual integration into the military. The Air Force survey found that 67 percent of men and 43

percent of women oppose integration; and the Los Angeles Times survey found that 74 percent of the active-duty force opposes lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military.

Second, Army and active-duty surveys indicate some congruity between the attitude or opinion of a majority of service members with the teachings of the “Majority” Christian position. Miller’s results suggest that a majority of soldiers consider homosexuality to be perverted, immoral, and sinful. When asked to state reasons for opposing homosexual integration into the military, the second-most and fourth-most numerous responses to the Los Angeles Times survey stated that homosexuality is immoral and against individual personal beliefs.

Therefore, in answer to the primary thesis question, combining these two points of agreement leads to the conclusion that a large portion of the active-duty military understands homosexuality in a way consistent with the “Majority” Christian teaching; that is, homosexuality is immoral; homosexuality is not compatible with the requirements of the military services; and homosexuals should not be integrated into the military. It further suggests that the teachings of the “Majority” Christian denominations have influenced the attitudes of military personnel with respect to the 1993 initiative to integrate homosexuals into the military.

V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A. CONCLUSIONS

The research conducted for this thesis has sought to determine if the personal religious beliefs of military members influence their responses to policies that they perceive as involving morality, specifically with regard to the 1993 proposal to integrate homosexuals into the military. The political circumstances surrounding President Clinton's initiative to integrate homosexuals into the military laid the foundation for this research in Chapter I.

Chapter II presented a three-part literature review of America's religious heritage, the historical context of the First Amendment to the Constitution, and a summary of historical military policies toward homosexuals. First, it documented the presence of Christian influence in the design and implementation of national policy, from the very beginning of European settlement in the United States. It established that the Constitution was written by men who instituted laws and government based on the tenets of the Old and New Testaments. Further, it contended that the Bible was a basis for the establishment of America's system of laws, and that the laws were written in accordance with Christian ideals and a desire to live Godly lives.

The literature review identified numerous presidents who expressed views that America's prosperity was dependent on the extension of God's blessings. It established that the Founding Fathers advocated the incorporation of Christian principles into the national decision-making process, and the application of these principles to the nation as a whole.

The historical context of the First Amendment to the Constitution was also analyzed as a part of the literature review. This analysis sought to determine if the 1947 Supreme Court interpretation of the First Amendment, which is currently used as the authority to exclude religious dialogue from the affairs of the state, is consistent with previous Supreme Court interpretations and the intentions of the Founding Fathers.

The Supreme Court's current interpretation states that the First Amendment's purpose is to erect "a wall between the church and the state . . . [which] must be kept high and impregnable."¹⁹¹ Research suggested that this interpretation is inconsistent with Supreme Court rulings prior to 1947.

In 1853, Congress, and in 1878, the Supreme Court, were challenged regarding the (then) practice of incorporating Christian principle into the national decision-making process. In both instances, rulings stated that it was not possible to separate the application of Christian principles from the American system of government. In the second instance, Thomas Jefferson's letter to the Danbury Baptists, which includes the now famous phrase, "separation of church and state," was used as a reason to ensure that Christian principle remained a part of government. In 1892, the Supreme Court ruled that the United States was a "Christian nation," and based this ruling on 87 different historical precedents.

In its 1947 interpretation, the Supreme Court, for the first time, interpreted the First Amendment to mean that Christian influence should be excluded from the public decision-making process. Its interpretation was based in part on Jefferson's letter to the Danbury

¹⁹¹ Everson v. Board of Education.

Baptists, but again, for the first time, the Supreme Court failed to cite the entire letter, choosing rather to cite only the now-famous eight words.

Research established a number of reasons for the Founding Fathers' issuance of the First Amendment, on which there is broad agreement. These included: the desire to avoid the creation of a state church, such as had occurred in England; the desire to protect individual states from federal interference in existing church-state relationships; and the desire to protect individual citizens from federal denial of free exercise of religion.

The Reverend Jasper Adams, cousin of President John Adams, suggested in 1833 that the First Amendment was a profession of the American nations' desire to function as a Christian nation. Research showed that, in the late 18th century, any notion that the First Amendment was framed to foster a strict policy of state neutrality toward religion would have met with "universal disapprobation, if not universal indignation."¹⁹²

Further, research suggested that the Founding Fathers did not intend the First Amendment to remove the influence of Christian principle from the public decision-making process. Too often did they directly incorporate these principles into the decision-making process for this to be the case. It would seem, at the very least, that the First Amendment to the Constitution was not intended to erect an impregnable wall between the church and the state.

The literature review closed with an overview of the military's historical treatment of homosexuals. Prior to World War I, U.S. military law did not specifically address the issue of homosexuality. However, by the end of World War I, legislation had been

¹⁹² Storey, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States.

established. Military legislation took a variety of forms from the late 1910s to 1993, when the Clinton Administration sought to lift the military ban on homosexuals by overturning a policy that stated, “homosexuality is incompatible with military life.”¹⁹³

This attempt to lift the ban met with considerable opposition, and resulted in a policy called “Don’t Ask, Don’t Tell, Don’t Pursue” on December 21, 1993. The new policy was a compromise between total exclusion of homosexuals from the military and a lifting of the ban.

Chapter II raised a number of issues regarding the issue of morality and national decision-making. It argues that the Founding Fathers and early presidents incorporated Christian moral values in the decision-making process and that, prior to 1947, the first Amendment to the Constitution actually authorized Christian influence in the national decision-making process. Additionally, it laid the background for the research documented in Chapter IV, which sought to answer the primary research question regarding the personal religious beliefs of active-duty personnel.

The religious demographics of the active-duty military (with the exception of the Coast Guard) and the religious demographics of American society are detailed in Chapter IV. Further, the official doctrines of the seven largest Christian denominations represented in the military, with regard to homosexual integration into the military, are documented. Finally, results are analyzed from surveys of active-duty, military personnel that were conducted at the time of President Clinton’s 1993 attempt to integrate homosexuals into the military.

¹⁹³ U.S. Department of Defense, Directive No. 1332.14.

Liaison with the chaplaincy departments of the Army, Navy, and Air Force established that each service, including the Marine Corps (which is administered by the Navy), records the religious preferences of all active-duty personnel when they join the military. Active-duty personnel are instructed to select from a list of 162 religious preference alternatives. The Navy is the only exception to this procedure in the case of its officer corps, which is surveyed annually and only offered nine religious alternatives.

Analysis of the military's religious demographics shows that 75.3 percent of active-duty personnel consider themselves to be Christian, 21.9 percent hold no religious preference, and 2.7 percent are unsure of their religious preference. No other religious faith represents more than 2 percent of the active-duty force.

The largest Christian denominational groups represented in the military are Roman Catholic (25.2 percent), Baptist (22.3 percent), Methodist (4.9 percent), and Lutheran (3.5 percent). Of these, the largest denominations are the Roman Catholic Church, the Southern Baptist Convention, the American Baptist Church, the General Association of General Baptists, the National Baptist Church, the United Methodist Church, and the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America.

Other denominations represented in sizable proportions include the Pentecostal Church (1.5 percent), the Presbyterian Church (1.4 percent), and the Episcopal Church (1.0 percent). Of the remaining religious categories, the largest faith group is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with 1.1 percent. The Jewish, Muslim, and Buddhist faiths represent 0.4 percent, 0.3 percent, and 0.2 percent of the force, respectively. Hindus and Jehovah's Witnesses each represent less than 0.1 percent of the force.

Comparison between the religious demographics of military personnel and those of the general population show that the Christian faith is 8.7 percentage points under-represented in the military. Likewise, the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and the Jewish faith are under-represented. There are, however, nearly twice as many active-duty personnel with no religious preference than is the case in the general population.

The doctrines of the seven largest Christian denominations were obtained from denominational endorsing agents, and are summarized into three categories. First, there is a number of denominations that oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military. These include the Roman Catholic Church and the Southern Baptist Convention. Their position is termed the “Majority” Christian position, since they represent the largest portion of the active-duty military, as well as of the general population.

These denominations base their teaching on Biblical references instructing that homosexual acts are immoral and that unrepentant homosexuals will not inherit eternal life. They oppose efforts to openly affirm homosexuality, state that homosexuality is incompatible with the requirements of service life, and categorically oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military. While firmly supporting the requirement to treat homosexuals with respect, compassion, and sensitivity, they do not consider the exclusion of homosexuals from the military to be a form of unjust discrimination. This position can be summarized as teaching that homosexuality is immoral, not compatible with the requirements of the military services, and that homosexuals should not be integrated into the military.

Second, there is a category that, while stating that homosexuality is incompatible with

Christian teaching, places strong emphasis on the equal rights of all persons regardless of sexual orientation. Denominations in this category are committed to ensuring that basic human rights and civil liberties are available to all persons. They have no objection to homosexuals serving in the military. Although not stated in any official policy document, this position is most strongly expressed by the United Methodist Church. This position is defined as the “Minority A” Christian position.

Third, there is a number of denominations that have not officially stated a position with regard to homosexual integration into the military. These include the American Baptist Church, the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, and the General Association of General Baptists. Although larger than the “Minority A” category, this category represents less of the active-duty military than the “Majority” category, and is therefore termed the “Minority B” Christian position.

Surveys of active-duty personnel were conducted during the period from late 1992 to early 1993. These surveys sought to establish the attitudes of military members with regard to President Clinton’s initiative to lift the ban on homosexuals in the armed forces.

Survey results suggest that a majority of active-duty personnel oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military. A survey of Army personnel found that 75 percent of male soldiers and 43 percent of female soldiers opposed the integration of homosexuals. A survey of the Air Force found that 67 percent of men and 43 percent of women opposed integration. At the same time, a survey of active-duty, military personnel in all services found that 74 percent of the respondents opposed lifting the ban on homosexuals in the military.

Further, survey findings suggest that a large portion of the active-duty military oppose homosexual integration for reasons that are consistent with Christian teaching. For example, the Army survey found that a majority of soldiers consider homosexuality to be “perverted, immoral and sinful.” When asked to state reasons for opposing homosexual integration into the military, the second-most and fourth-most numerous responses to the active-duty military survey stated that homosexuality was “immoral” and against individual religious beliefs.

The survey of active-duty, military personnel also found that 88 percent of respondents consider themselves to be “religious.” When this proportion is compared with the religious demographics of the active-duty force, which establishes that 75.2 percent of active-duty personnel categorize themselves as Christian, the implication is that the vast majority of personnel who define themselves as “religious” would be categorized as Christian.

The final observation drawn from these surveys is based on the combination of consistent findings among the surveys. These are, that a majority of active-duty personnel oppose homosexual integration into the military, and that many personnel provide reasons for this opposition that are consistent with Christian teaching.

This suggests that a large portion of the active-duty military understands homosexuality in a way that is consistent with the “Majority” Christian position; that is, homosexuality is immoral; homosexuality is not compatible with the requirements of the military services; and homosexuals should not be integrated into the military. One may infer from this that the teachings of the “Majority” Christian denominations have likely

influenced the attitudes of military personnel to oppose the 1993 initiative to integrate homosexuals into the military.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the chaplaincy departments standardize the way in which they record the religious preferences of service members. Future analysis of force religious demographics would be much easier if the Navy recorded its officers' preferences in a way consistent with the other services.

This research has established a concern that needs to be addressed before any further policy initiative is launched to alter existing moral norms. Survey results suggest that active-duty service members oppose the integration of homosexuals into the military, based on beliefs that are consistent with "Majority" Christian teaching. These beliefs are that homosexuality is immoral, incompatible with the requirements of military service, and that homosexuals should not be integrated into the military.

Simultaneously, many proponents of homosexual integration into the military argue a different form of morality. Proponents describe exclusionary policies as "blind prejudice and bigotry,"¹⁹⁴ discrimination,¹⁹⁵ and mired in "premodern politics."¹⁹⁶ The President of

¹⁹⁴ Korb, Lawrence, "Perspectives on the Military's Policy on Homosexuals," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 224.

¹⁹⁵ Segal, David R., Gade Paul A. and Johnson, Edgar M., "Social Science Research on Homosexuals in the Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 48.

¹⁹⁶ Adam, Barry D., "Anatomy of a Panic: State Voyeurism, Gender Politics, and the Cult of Americanism," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994), p. 105.

the United States agrees with this perspective. In a letter to Mr. Paul Pettijohn, President Clinton stated: "I believe that people should be judged by their conduct, not by their status. I favor stricter rules of conduct on sexual behavior for all military personnel, along with lifting the ban."¹⁹⁷ Similarly, in a letter to Reverend Paul Gilchrist, President Clinton reiterated his position: "I oppose unnecessary discrimination against any American. We don't have a person to waste."¹⁹⁸

These understandings may be consistent with those taught by the "Minority A" Christian denomination. However, they are not consistent with the majority of Christian teaching or the expressed beliefs of active-duty service members. This research suggests that there is a correlation between "Majority" Christian teachings and the stated moral beliefs of service members.

The introduction of policies opposing the majority of Christian teaching, on which the laws of the United States were established, and by which it appears a majority of its citizens are at least influenced, may move the military toward an area of moral uncertainty. Moral uncertainty within service members does not lead to an effective fighting force, and according to General George C. Marshall, may ultimately lead to defeat on the battlefield.¹⁹⁹

Altering the underlying standard of morality in the military, which is similar in many

¹⁹⁷ Clinton, William J., to Pettijohn, Paul C., February 26, 1993, The White House, Washington, D.C.

¹⁹⁸ Clinton, William J., to Gilchrist, Paul R., Presbyterian Church in America, June 28, 1993, The White House, Washington, D.C.

¹⁹⁹ Shea, Donald W., "A Ministry in the Eye of the Storm," Army, September 1991, p. 54.

ways to the “Majority” Christian position, would, according to “Majority” Christian teaching, be “a sign of God’s surrendering of a society to its perversions.”²⁰⁰ This would place the United States in a dangerous position, if the expressed beliefs of men such as George Washington, John Adams, and Abraham Lincoln are correct. They stated that America’s continued prosperity was dependent on the extension of God’s grace. It is inconsistent with “Majority” Christian teaching for God’s grace to be extended to a nation after it has been handed over to its “perversions.”

In summary, there is a conflict between the moral beliefs of most active-duty personnel (which appear consistent with “Majority” Christian teaching) and the objectives of homosexual integration. This conflict raises questions concerning the effectiveness of any future policy that would lift the ban on the military service of homosexuals. One may ask, for example, what the possible effects of lifting the ban would have on recruiting and personnel retention as well as interpersonnel working relationships and unit cohesion. It is recommended that this conflict be addressed before any future initiative is launched to integrate homosexuals into the military.

C. AREAS FOR POTENTIAL FUTURE RESEARCH

Follow-on studies should refine the findings made in this thesis. Of particular benefit would be research to explore the possible connections between the moral beliefs of service personnel and the influence of religious teachings. This could include a review of the

²⁰⁰ Southern Baptist Convention, “Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights.”

moral beliefs of service personnel on homosexual integration into the military as well as other issues.

Research should be conducted into the doctrines of additional denominations within the broad denominational categories of Catholic, Baptist, Methodist, and Lutheran. This would provide a more detailed understanding of the various teachings within each category, and a greater listing of the denominations in the “Majority,” “Minority A,” and “Minority B” Christian categories.

APPENDIX A ENDORSING AGENT QUESTIONS

Q. Is homosexuality a sin?

Q. Why or why not?

Q. What is your denomination's doctrine/teaching regarding homosexual behavior?

Q. What is your denomination's doctrine/teaching regarding homosexual orientation?

Q. Does your denomination recognize a difference between homosexual orientation and homosexual behavior?

Q. Why or why not?

Q. Does your denomination teach that homosexuality is a learned or genetic behavior?

Q. Why?

Q. Is this difference, between learned or genetic, significant to your denomination's doctrine?

Q. What is your denomination's doctrine/teaching regarding open homosexual service in the military?

Q. Would your denomination have any reservations or concerns with continued Chaplaincy support to the military, should homosexuals be allowed to serve in the military?

Q. Do you consider there to be a conflict of interest, for members of your denomination, should they serve in a military that allows homosexuals to serve?

Q. Has your denomination tried to influence national policy on the matter of homosexual military service (i.e., petitioned the President or Congress, submitted Congressional

hearings, etc.)?

Q. Has your denomination provided direction to chaplains on the issue of homosexual service? If so, what has this direction involved?

Q. What should be the response of members of your denomination toward homosexuals?

Q. How can members of your denomination best interact with homosexuals?

Q. What are the biblical or other references on which your denomination's doctrine/teachings are based?

APPENDIX B MILITARY RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE

ALTERNATIVES

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
00	No Preference Recorded
01	No Religious Preference
02	Seventh-Day Adventist
03	Independent Assemblies of God Fellowship International
04	Assemblies of God
05	Grace Gospel Fellowship
06	American Baptist Church in USA
07	Independent Baptist Bible Mission
08	Southern Baptist Convention
09	National Association of Free Will Baptists
10	Baptist Churches, Other
12	Brethren Church
13	Christian: NDP
14	Buddhism
16	Christian Scientist (Church of Christ Scientist)
18	Church of Christ
19	Church of God in Christ
20	Church of God

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
24	Christian Church (Disciples of Christ)
26	Episcopal Church, The
32	Friends
34	Jehovah's Witnesses
36	Jewish
38	Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
40	Lutheran Churches
41	Lutheran Council in the USA
44	Methodist Churches
45	Evangelical Church of North America
46	Evangelical Covenant Church in America
47	Evangelical Church Alliance, The
48	Muslim
49	Hindu
50	Church of the Nazarene
53	Eastern Orthodox Churches
54	Full Gospel Fellowship of Churches & Missionaries, Inc.
55	Full Gospel Pentecostal Association, The
56	Pentecostal Churches
57	United Pentecostal Church, International
58	Presbyterian Churches

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
60	Reformed Churches
62	Roman Catholic Church
64	Salvation Army, The
66	Unitarian Universalist Association
68	United Church of Christ
70	Protestant: Other Churches
72	Protestant: No Denominational Preference
74	Other Religions
75	Atheist
99	Unknown
AA	Asbury Bible Church
AB	Bible Protestant Church
AC	Congregational Methodist Church
AD	Evangelical Methodist Church of America
AE	Fundamental Methodist Church, Inc.
AF	Independent Churches Affiliated
AG	Independent Fundamental Bible Churches
AH	Tioga River Christian Conference
AJ	Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist Conference
AK	Methodist Protestant Church
AL	Militant Fundamental Bible Churches

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
AM	United Christian Church
AO	American Council of Christian Churches
BA	Anglican Orthodox Church, The
BB	Baptist Bible Fellowship
BC	Brethren in Christ Fellowship
BD	Christian Crusade
BE	Independent Baptist Churches
BF	Independent Lutheran Churches
BG	Southwide Baptist Fellowship
BH	Bible Presbyterian Church
BO	Associated Gospel Churches, Inc.
CA	American Baptist Association
CD	Baptist Missionary Association of America
CE	Free Will Baptists
CF	General Association of General Baptists
CG	General Association of Regular Baptist Churches
CH	American Baptist Convention
CI	American Baptist Church in the USA
CJ	World Baptist Fellowship
CK	Kingsway Fellowship
DA	Advent Christian Church

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
DB	African Methodist Episcopal Church
DC	African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church
DD	Baptist General Conference
DE	Christian Methodist Episcopal Church
DF	Christian Reformed Church
DG	Church in God (Anderson, IN)
DH	Church of God in North America
DJ	Evangelical Congregational Church
DL	Free Will Baptist, NC State Convention of
DM	Moravian Church
DN	National Association of Congregational Christian Churches
DO	General Commission of Chaplains & Armed Forces Personnel
DP	National Baptist Convention of America
DQ	National Baptist Convention, USA, Inc.
DR	North American Baptist Conference
DS	Primitive Methodist Church, USA
DT	Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc.
DU	Reformed Church in America
DV	Church of God General Conference
DW	Seventh Day Baptist General Conference
DX	Churches of God, General Conference

Code Denomination

DY	Schwenkfelder Churches, The General Conference of
DZ	Swedenborgian Church, The General Conference of
ED	Church of God of Prophecy
EH	Independent Fundamental Churches of America
EJ	Fellowship of Grace Brethren
EK	Plymouth Brethren
EL	Reformed Church in the United States
EM	Reformed Episcopal Church
EN	Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints
EO	Independent Denominational Endorsing Agencies
EP	Churches of Christ
FA	Reform Judiasm
FB	Conservative Judiasm
FC	Orthodox Judiasm
GA	Lutheran Church in America
GB	American Lutheran Church, The
GC	Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod
GD	Evangelical Lutheran Churches, Association of
GE	Evangelical Lutheran Church of America
JA	Christian and Missionary Alliance
JB	Christian Churches and Churches of Christ

<u>Code</u>	<u>Denomination</u>
JC	Church of God (Cleveland, TN)
JD	Church of the United Brethren in Christ
JE	Churches of Christ in Christian Union
JF	Conservative Baptist Association of America
JG	Conservative Congregational Church Conference
JH	Elim Fellowship
JJ	Evangelical Free Church of America
JK	Evangelical Friends Alliance
JL	Evangelical Methodist Church
JM	International Church of Foursquare Gospel
JN	Open Bible Standard Church, Inc.
JO	National Association of Evangelicals
JP	Pentecostal Church of God in America, Inc.
JQ	Pentecostal Holiness Church
JR	Missionary Church, The
JS	General Conference of the Brethren Church
JT	Central Bible Church
JU	Free Lutheran Congregations, The Association of
JW	Kansas Yearly Meeting of Friends
JX	Missionary Church Association
JY	Ohio Yearly Meeting of Friends

Code Denomination

LA	Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod)
LB	Cumberland Presbyterian Church
LC	Presbyterian Church in the United States
LD	United Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod
LE	Orthodox Presbyterian Church, The
LF	Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod
LG	United Presbyterian Church in the USA
LH	Presbyterian Church in America
LJ	Presbyterian Council for Chaplains & Military Personnel
LV	Evangelical Presbyterian Church
MA	Sikh
MB	Greek Catholic Church
NA	The United Methodist Church
NB	Free Methodist Church in North America
NC	Primitive Methodist Church, The
ND	Wesleyan Church, The
NE	Southern Methodist Church
NF	United Methodist Church, The

APPENDIX C RELIGIOUS PREFERENCE GROUPINGS

Grouped in the category of Baptist was the American Baptist Church in the U.S.A. (Code 06), Independent Baptist Bible Mission (Code 07), National Association of Free Will Baptists (Code 09), Other Baptist Churches (Code 10), Ukrainian Evangelical Baptist Conference (Code AJ), Independent Baptist Churches (Code BE), Southwide Baptist Fellowship (Code BG), American Baptist Association (Code CA), Baptist Missionary Association of America (Code CD), Free Will Baptists (CE), General Association of General Baptists (Code CF), General Association of Regular Baptist Churches (Code CG), American Baptist Convention (Code CH), American Baptist Church in the U.S.A. (Code CI), World Baptist Fellowship (Code CJ), Baptist General Conference (Code DD), N.C. State Convention of Free Will Baptists, (Code DL), National Baptist Convention of America (Code DP), National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc. (Code DQ), North American Baptist Conference (Code DR), Progressive National Baptist Convention, Inc. (Code DT), and the Conservative Baptist Association of America (Code JF).

The Methodist Church was made up of Methodist Churches (Code 40), Congregational Methodist Church (Code AC), Evangelical Methodist Church of America (Code AD), Fundamental Methodist Church, Inc. (Code AE), Methodist Protestant Church (Code AK), Primitive Methodist Church, U.S.A. (Code DS), The United Methodist Church (Code NA), Free Methodist Church in North America (Code NB), the Primitive Methodist Church (Code NC), Southern Methodist Church (Code NE) and the United Methodist Church (Code NF).

Grouped into the category of Lutheran was Lutheran Churches (Code 40), Lutheran Council in the U.S.A. (Code 41), Independent Lutheran Churches (Code BF), Lutheran Church in America (Code GA), the American Lutheran Church (Code GB), Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod (Code GC), the Association of Evangelical Lutheran Churches (Code GD), Evangelical Lutheran Church of America (Code GE) and the Association of Free Lutheran Congregations (JU).

Pentecostal Churches consisted of the Full Gospel Pentecostal Association (Code 55), Pentecostal Churches (Code 56), United Pentecostal Church, International (Code 57), Church of God of Prophecy (Code ED), International Church of Foursquare Gospel (Code JM), Open Bible Standard Churches, Inc. (Code JN), Pentecostal Church of God in America, Inc. (Code JP) and Pentecostal Holiness Church (Code JQ).

Presbyterian Churches consisted of Presbyterian Churches (Code 58), Bible Presbyterian Church (Code BH), Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church (General Synod) (Code LA), Cumberland Presbyterian Church (Code LB), Presbyterian Church in the United States (Code LC), United Presbyterian Church Evangelical Synod (Code LD), the Orthodox Presbyterian Church (Code LE), Reformed Presbyterian Church, Evangelical Synod (Code LF), United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A. (Code LG), Presbyterian Church in America (Code LH), Presbyterian Council for Chaplains & Military Personnel (Code LJ) and the Evangelical Presbyterian Church (Code LV).

The Episcopal Church (Code 26) and the Reformed Episcopal Church (Code EM) were grouped to form the Episcopal Church category. With the exception of the Roman Catholic Church and Eastern Orthodox Churches all remaining Christian denominations

were grouped into the category of Protestant Churches.

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints consisted of Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Code 38) and Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Code EN). The Jewish religion included Jewish (Code 36), Reform Judaism (Code FA), Conservative Judaism (Code FB) and Orthodox Judaism (Code FC).

Christian Science (Church of Christ Scientist) (Code 16), Unitarian Universalist Association (Code 66), Other Religions (Code 74), the General Conference of the Swedenborgian Church (Code DZ) and Sikh (Code MA) were grouped into the category of Other Religions.

Buddhists, Hindus, Jehovahs Witnesses and Muslims were identified as separate faiths.

APPENDIX D OTHER RELIGIONS AND CULTS

Of the 162 religious preference alternatives offered to service personnel, five fall into the category of world religions. These are Buddhist, Hindu, Sikh, Muslim and Jew. The Jewish faith had four alternatives offered which were Jew, Reform Judaism, Conservative Judaism and Orthodox Judaism.

Four of the religious preference alternatives offered are defined as pseudo-Christian cults by Watchman Fellowship Inc., a Christian organization specializing in the documentation of cult beliefs. A Pseudo-Christian cult is defined as an organization that seeks to

... explicitly or implicitly deny essential Christian doctrine. They operate under the guise of Christianity but deviate from the orthodox teachings of the historic Christian faith communicated by Scripture and codified by the ancient ecumenical creeds.²⁰¹

Included in this category is the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Reformed Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, the Jehovah Witnesses Church and Christian Science (Church of Christ Scientist).²⁰² These groups have doctrines with similarities to Christianity, yet significant differences with regard to teachings on the nature of God, heaven, hell and eternal life.

Watchman Fellowship describes the Unitarian Universalist Association as “a liberal offshoot of Protestantism which has produced a wide spectrum of beliefs ranging from

²⁰¹ Christian Research Institute International, “Defining Terms: Cult and Occult,” Statement No.: DG-945.

²⁰² Branch, Craig, Watchman Fellowship Inc., to Peterson, Mike, January 17, 1997.

agnostics to new age and occult beliefs and expressions.”²⁰³ The acceptance of such practices and beliefs is contradictory of one of the basic teaching of Christianity that there is only one God who is to be loved with all a person’s heart, soul and mind.²⁰⁴ The occult is by definition Satan worship and as such, incompatible with Christianity.

The General Conference of the Swedenborgian Church is defined as a new age/occult religion.²⁰⁵

²⁰³ Ibid.

²⁰⁴ Matthew 22:37.

²⁰⁵ Branch, to Peterson.

APPENDIX E CATECHISM OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

PART THREE, ARTICLE 6, SECTION II

CHASTITY AND HOMOSEXUALITY

2357 Homosexuality refers to relations between men or between women who experience an exclusive or predominant sexual attraction toward persons of the same sex. It has taken a great variety of forms through the centuries and in different cultures. Its psychological genesis remains largely unexplained. Basing itself on Sacred Scriptures, which presents homosexual acts as acts of grave depravity (Genesis 19:1-29, Romans 1:24-27, 1 Corinthians 6:10 and Timothy 1:10), tradition has always declared that ‘homosexual acts are intrinsically disordered’. They are contrary to the natural law. They close the sexual act to the gift of life. They do not proceed from a genuine affective and sexual complementarity. Under no circumstances can they be approved.

2358 The number of men and women who have deep-seated homosexual tendencies is not negligible. They do not choose their homosexual condition; for most of them it is a trial. They must be accepted with respect, compassion and sensitivity. Every sign of unjust discrimination in their regard should be avoided. These persons are called to fulfill God’s will in their lives and, if they are Christians, to unite to the sacrifice of the Lord’s Cross the difficulties they may encounter from their condition.

2359 Homosexual persons are called to chastity. By the virtues of self-mastery that teach them inner freedom, at times by the support of disinterested friendship, by prayer and sacramental grace, they can and should gradually and resolutely approach Christian perfection.

APPENDIX F ROMAN CATHOLIC STATEMENT
CONCERNING THE ADMITTANCE OF HOMOSEXUAL PERSONS
TO MILITARY SERVICE

INTRODUCTION

“The God who is at once truth and love calls the Church to minister to every man, woman and child with the pastoral solicitude of our Compassionate Lord.”

On the Pastoral Care of Homosexual Persons

Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (CDF), 1986

1. In my letter of 27 January 1993 to President Clinton the position of the Military Archdiocese on the admittance of homosexuals into the military was made clear. We oppose such action. This statement is intended to provide our Catholic chaplains with a clarification of our position.
2. Within the Catholic Church the Archdiocese for the Military Services USA bears a unique responsibility for the spiritual well being of all Catholics serving in our armed forces. It is also concerned with the spiritual welfare of those who wish to apply for military service.
3. The current controversy over admitting homosexually oriented persons to military service presents the Military Archdiocese with a unique occasion to reaffirm consistent Catholic moral teaching on human sexuality and the rights belonging to all human persons.
4. The Catholic Church teaches that the virtue of chastity is to be practiced both by those

who are married and by those who are single. Neither heterosexual activity outside of marriage nor homosexual activity under any circumstances is ever morally permissible. Both are against the law of God and His Church. This teaching must be reemphasized to our people.

5. Persons, military or civilian, who come to us for assistance, advice, counseling on any matter whatever, including heterosexual or homosexual problems, must always be treated with kindness, charity and with the highest degree of confidentiality.

COMMON GOOD and INDIVIDUAL GOOD

6. Various reasons have been brought forward in opposition to the admittance of homosexually oriented persons to military service. This opposition is largely based on preservation and promotion of the common good, for example, the maintenance of military discipline and esprit de corps, and the impact that homosexually oriented persons in the military would have on service recruiting efforts.

7. Many who oppose lifting the ban on admitting homosexually oriented persons to military service have indicated concern over other dimensions of the common good. They argue that, if homosexually oriented persons should be accepted in the military, other issues may be accepted to arise: affirmative action for homosexuals; homosexual quotas at the military academies; housing arrangements for homosexuals; acceptance of homosexuality as an appropriate alternate lifestyle within the armed forces.

8. While this Archdiocese is also concerned with the common good and agrees that serious and harmful consequences, such as those noted above, could well result from the admittance of homosexually orientated persons into the military services, the Archdiocese

bases its argument on and is motivated primarily by the Catholic Church's consistent teaching on the individual good, the moral and spiritual welfare of the individual person, namely, the right and concomitant obligation of every person to strive to live virtuously in pursuit of eternal happiness.

9. We are well aware that certain heterosexual conduct in the military reflects our present national attitudes towards morality and can seriously challenge an individual's heterosexuality chastity. This is a reality that we hope will continue to be addressed by our military leaders to the extent possible for them to do so. However, we do not see the wisdom of compounding the problem at this time by lifting restrictions on the homosexuality oriented serving in the military, and thereby subjecting these persons to undue temptations against chastity by requiring them to live daily, often over long periods of time, in intimate proximity to others of the same sex, in close quarters aboard ships at sea or in military barracks.

10. In stating this, we, as members of the Catholic Church, continue to affirm the innate value of all persons and to advocate respect for the intrinsic human rights of all persons, regardless of sexual orientation.

It is deplorable that homosexual persons have been and are the object of violent malice in speech or in action. Such treatment deserves condemnation from the Church's pastors wherever it occurs. It reveals a kind of disregard for others which endangers the most fundamental principles of a healthy society. The intrinsic dignity of each person must always be respected in word, in action and in law. (CDF 1992, #7)

Homosexual persons, as human persons, have the same rights as all persons, including the right of not being treated in a manner which offends their dignity. (CDF 1992, #12)

11. However, in its belief that human sexuality must always be intrinsically linked to the primacy of family life, the Catholic Church clearly teaches that the homosexual

orientation is in itself an objective disorder. The orientation in any given individual is in itself not sinful, but may not be used to justify homosexual activity which is sinful.

12. As is well known, for various physical, mental, emotional and psychological reasons certain persons are refused admittance into specific occupations, e.g., piloting airplanes, performing surgical procedures, operating dangerous machinery.

13. This is not unjust discrimination, nor is it a violation of anyone's human rights. It is just and proper - because it seeks to protect the common good of society and the security and safety of the individual persons involved. This matter was put into clear perspective by the Vatican's Congregation for the Doctrine of the faith in its statement of July 1992:

There are areas in which it is not unjust discrimination to take sexual orientation into account, for example, in the placement of children for adoption or foster care, in employment of teachers or coaches and in military recruitment. (CDF 1992, #11)

14. Therefore, it would not be an abridgement of human rights to deny homosexually oriented persons admittance to the armed forces for their own moral safety and for the sake of military readiness and accomplishment of the mission assigned.

APPENDIX G

SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION RESOLUTION NO. 3

ON HOMOSEXUALITY, MILITARY SERVICE AND CIVIL

RIGHTS

Whereas, Homosexuality is immoral, contrary to the Bible (Lev. 18:22, 1 Cor. 6:9-10) and contrary to traditional Judeo-Christian moral standards, and the open affirmation of homosexuality represents a sign of God's surrendering a society to its perversions (Rom. 1:18-32); and

Whereas, Open and avowed homosexuality is incompatible with the requirements of military service according to high ranking military officers and most military personnel; and

Whereas, homosexual conduct is inconsistent with the Uniform Code of Military Justice and is detrimental to morale, unit cohesion, good order, discipline, and mission accomplishment; and

Whereas, Homosexuality in the military would endanger the life and health of military personnel by the increased exposure to sexually transmitted diseases and by enhanced danger of tainted blood in battlefield conditions; and

Whereas, Open homosexuality in the military would have significant adverse impact on the Pentagon's budget including medical, legal and social costs; and

Whereas, Southern Baptist and other evangelical military chaplains may be pressured

to compromise the essential gospel message, withhold their biblical convictions about this sexual perversion and submit to “sensitivity training” concerning homosexuality if openly declared homosexuals are permitted to serve; and

Whereas, Southern Baptists and other evangelical members of the armed forces will be placed in compromising environments which will violate their conscience if the ban is lifted and will discourage other potential evangelical recruits from serving in the armed forces; and

Whereas, Homosexual politics is masquerading today as “civil rights,” in order to exploit the moral high ground of the civil rights movement even though homosexual conduct and other learned sexual deviances have nothing in common with the moral movement to stop discrimination against race and gender; and

Whereas, Government should not give special legal protection and endorsement to homosexuality, nor impose legal sanctions against those who believe homosexual conduct to be immoral.

Therefore, be it RESOLVED, That we, the messengers to the Southern Baptist Convention, meeting at Houston, Texas, June 15-17, 1993, affirm the biblical truth that homosexuality is sin, as well as the biblical promise that all persons, including homosexuals, can receive abundant, new and eternal life by repenting of their sin and trusting Jesus Christ as Savior and Lord (1 Cor. 6:11); and

Be it further RESOLVED, That we oppose all effort to provide government endorsement, sanction, recognition, acceptance, or civil rights advantage on the basis of homosexuality; and

Be it further RESOLVED, That we oppose lifting the ban on homosexuals serving in the armed forces, and that we support passage of any legislation before Congress which restores and enforces the ban; and

Be it further RESOLVED, That we deplore acts of hatred or violence committed by homosexuals against those who take a stand for traditional morality as well as acts of hatred or violence committed against homosexuals; and

Be it finally RESOLVED, That we express our profound pride in and support of those who serve in the United States military, and for our chaplains in the military as they perform their ministry based on biblical principles and moral convictions, in an increasingly tumultuous environment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Adams, Jasper, The Relation of Christianity to Civil Government in the United States, 2nd Edition, (Charleston, South Carolina: A. E. Miller, 1833).
- Barton, David, America's Godly Heritage, (Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press, 1993).
- Barton, David, The Myth of Separation, (Aledo, TX: Wallbuilder Press, 1991).
- Bergh, Albert Ellery, Ed., The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XVI.
- Dreisbach, Daniel, Real Threat and Mere Shadow: Religious Liberty and the First Amendment, (Westchester, IL: Crossway Books, 1987).
- Flood, Robert, The Rebirth of America, (Philadelphia: The Arthur S. Demoss Foundation, 1986).
- Halley, Henry, Halley's Bible Handbook, (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1965).
- Hart, Benjamin, Faith and Freedom: The Christian Roots of American Liberty, (Dallas: Lewis and Stanley, 1988).
- Jefferson, Thomas, The Writings of Thomas Jefferson, (Washington, D.C.: The Thomas Jefferson Memorial Association, 1904), Vol. XIII.
- Johnson, Henry P., Ed., The Correspondence and Public Papers of John Jay, 1794 - 1826, (Reprinted NY: Burt Franklin, 1970), Vol. IV.
- Madison, James, Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of 1787 (1787, reprinted NY: W.W. Norton Coy., 1987).
- McClure, J. B., Ed., Abraham Lincoln's Stories and Speeches, (Chicago: Rhodes and McClure Publishing Coy., 1896).
- McDonald, William, Documentary Source Book of American History, 1606-1889, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909).
- Millard, Catherine, The Rewriting of America's History, (Camp Hill, PN: Horizon House Publishers, 1991).

- Morris, B. F., The Christian Life and Character of the Civil Institutions of the United States, (Philadelphia: George W. Childs, 1864).
- Palmer, John McAuley, General von Steuben, (Port Washington NY: Kenniket Press, 1966).
- Peterson, Merrill D., Ed., Jefferson's Writings, (NY: Liberty Classics of the United States Inc., 1984).
- Princeton Religion Research Center, Religion in America, 1995 - Suppliment, (Princeton, NJ: 1995).
- Princeton Religion Research Center, Religion in America, 1996, (Princeton, NJ: 1996).
- Ray, Ronald D., Military Necessity & Homosexuality, (Louisville, KN: First Principles, Inc., 1993).
- Richardson, James D., Ed., A Compilation of Messages and Papers of the Presidents, I, (New York: Bureau of National Literature, 1897).
- Roman Catholic Church, Catechism of the Catholic Church, (New York: Doubleday, 1994).
- Rutkow, Ira M., Ed., On the Examinations of Recruits and Discharge of Soldiers, (San Francisco: Norton, 1990).
- Shilts, Randy, Conduct Unbecoming: Lesbians and Gays in the U.S. Military, Vietnam to the Persian Gulf, (New York: St Martin's Press, 1993).
- Stanley, Sandra C. and Scott, Wilbur J., Eds., Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).
- Story, Joseph, Commentaries on the Constitution of the United States, 3rd Edition, Volume II, (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1858).
- Von Clausewitz, Carl, On War, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976).
- Whitehead, John W., The Second American Revolution, (Wheaton IL: Crossway Books, 1982).
- Wolf, William J., The Religion of Abraham Lincoln, (New York: Seabury Press, 1963).

B. STATEMENTS, AND RESOLUTIONS

American Baptist Church, "American Baptist Resolution Against Manifestations of Prejudice," General Board Reference # 8175:12/88, June 1989, Modified September 1992.

American Baptist Church, "American Baptist Resolution on Homosexuality," General Board Reference # - 8200:10/92, October 1992.

American Baptist Church, "Statement of Concern - Addressing Homosexuality and the Church," American Baptist Church Biennial Meeting, 1991.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, "Action of the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America," Adopted by the Church Council of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, March 27-29, 1993.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, "Human Sexuality and Sexual Behavior," Adopted by the Tenth General Convention of the American Lutheran Church (GC80.4.43), October 1980.

Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, "Sex, Marriage, and Family," Adopted by the Fifth Biennial Convention, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 25 - July 2, 1970.

General Association of General Baptists, "Proceedings and Reports of the 127th Annual Session of the General Association of General Baptists," July 16-18, 1996.

General Association of General Baptists, "The Social Principles of General Baptists."

Roman Catholic Church, "Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith," Number 11, The Vatican, Rome, July 1992.

Southern Baptist Convention, "Resolution No. 3 - On Homosexuality, Military Service and Civil Rights," Southern Baptist Convention Annual Meeting, Houston, Texas, June 15-17, 1993.

United Methodist Church, "Book of Discipline - 1996," 1996.

C. MISCELLANEOUS

- Adam, Barry D., "Anatomy of a Panic: State Voyeurism, Gender Politics, and the Cult of Americanism," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).
- Ambush, Peter, "Lifting the Gay Ban: A Chronology," Army Times, August 2, 1993.
- Bishops of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, to the Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, March 22, 1996, Chicago, Illinois.
- Branch, Craig, Watchman Fellowship Inc., to Peterson, Mike, January 17, 1997.
- Burrelli, David F., "An Overview of the Debate on Homosexuals in the U.S. Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).
- Chapman, Dwight, "General Association of General Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality," Telephone Interview with Mr. Dwight Chapman, February 14, 1997.
- Chief of Naval Operations, "Implementation of DoD Policy on Homosexual Conduct," Message, March 1, 1994.
- Christian Research Institute International, "Defining Terms: Cult and Occult," Statement No.: DG-945.
- Church of the Holy Trinity v. U.S., 143 U.S. 465, 471 (1892).
- Cleveland, Fred E., and Ohl, Mark A., "Don't Ask, Don't Tell" - Policy Analysis and Interpretation, Master's Thesis, Naval Postgraduate School, June 1994.
- Clinton, William, J., "Don't Ask, Don't Tell, Don't Pursue," Press Conference, Transcribed by Grace, Steve, Internet, Xmosaic, July 19, 1993.
- Clinton, William J., to Gilchrist, Paul R., Presbyterian Church in America, June 28, 1993, The White House, Washington, D.C.
- Clinton, William J., to Pettijohn, Paul C., February 26, 1993, The White House, Washington, D.C.
- Davis, Jeffrey S., "Military Policy towards Homosexuals: Scientific, Historical and Legal Perspectives," Military Law Review, 131, (Winter 1991).

“Defense Policy on Gays Takes Effect,” Washington Post, March 2, 1994.

Dimino, Joseph T., to Clinton, William J., January 27, 1993, Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Silver Springs, Maryland.

Dimino, Joseph T., to Military Chaplains of the Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., April 16, 1993, Archdiocese for the Military Services, U.S.A., Silver Spring, Maryland.

Ellis, Larry H., The Chaplain, United States Marine Corps, “The Ancient Curse,” Sermon by CAPT Ellis, 1993.

Everson v. Board of Education, 330 U.S. 1 (1947).

Gibson, G., “Chaplaincy Department Procedures Regarding the Recording of Religious Preferences,” Telephone Interview with Chaplain G. Gibson, Bureau of Navy Personnel, January 14, 1997.

Gilchrist, Paul R., to Clinton, William J., June 17, 1993, Atlanta, Georgia.

Hutchens, James M., Testimony Before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, One Hundred Third Congress, Washington, D. C., May 4-5, 1993.

James Kennedy, D., “The Spiritual State of the Union,” Gays in the Military - The Moral and Strategic Crisis, (Franklin, TN: Legacy Communications, 1993).

Journals of the Continental Congress, 1774-1789, (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1905).

Korb, Lawrence, “Perspectives on the Military’s Policy on Homosexuals,” Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).

Korb, Lawrence, Testimony Before the United States Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1993.

Lieutenant Colonel Jane Able, et al. v. United States of America, No. 94 CV 0974, slip op., (E.D.NY., 1995).

Lincoln, Abraham, Second Inaugural Address, 1865. Inscribed on the North Wall of the Lincoln Memorial, Washington D.C.

Los Angeles Times Poll, “Study # 307 - United States Military Survey,” February 11-16,

1993.

Maginnis, Robert L., "Clinton Administration Scuttles First Court Test of Military's Homosexual Law," Family Research Council Report, IS95D1HM.

Miller, Laura L., "Fighting for a Just Cause: Soldier's Views on Gays in the Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).

Miller, Laura L., "U.S. Military Surveys," (1992-93), Harvard University, January, 1997.

Mitchel, Thelma, American Baptist Churches U.S.A., to Peterson, Mike, January 10, 1997, Monterey, California.

Mitchel, Thelma, "American Baptist Doctrine and Homosexuality," Telephone Interview with Ms. Thelma Mitchel, February 14, 1997.

Nunn, Sam, to Johanning, Kirk, March 22, 1993, Washington, D. C.

Reynolds v. U.S., 98 U.S. 145 (1878).

Rushdoony, Rousas John, "The Freedom of the Church," Chalcedon Position Paper, No. 16, (1980).

Rushdoony, Rousas John, "Religion and the State," The Chalcedon Report, No. 152, (April 1978).

Sarbin, Theodore R., "The Deconstruction of Stereotypes: Homosexuality and Military Policy," (Defense Personnel Security Research and Education Center, Department of Defense).

Schwartzkopf, H. Norman, Testimony Before the United States Senate Committee on the Armed Forces, Washington, D. C., April 29, 1993.

Segal, David R., Gade Paul A. and Johnson, Edgar M., "Social Science Research on Homosexuals in the Military," Gays and Lesbians in the Military - Issues, Concerns and Contrasts, (Hawthorne, NY: Aldine de Gruyter, 1994).

Segal, David R., Testimony Before the House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services, One Hundred Third Congress, Washington, D. C., May 4-5, 1993.

Shea, Donald W., "A Ministry in the Eye of the Storm," Army, September 1991.

Sky, Theodore, "The Establishment Clause, the Congress and the Schools: An Historical Perspective," 52 Virginia Law Review 1395, (1966).

Townsend, James E., United Methodist Church, to Peterson, Mike, January 14, 1997, Monterey, California.

U.S. Department of Defense, Directive No.1332.14, Enlisted Administrative Separation, January 28, 1982, 1-9-1-13.

U.S. Department of Defense, the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Memorandum, January 16, 1981.

INITIAL DISTRIBUTION LIST

		No. Copies
1.	Defense Technical Information Center 8725 John J. Kingman Road., Ste 0944 Ft. Belvoir VA 22060-6218	2
2.	Dudley Knox Library Naval Postgraduate School 411 Dyer Rd. Monterey CA 93943-5101	2
3.	Capt. Mike Peterson Directorate of Personnel Plans - Army H-2-30 Russell Offices Canberra ACT 2600 Australia	3
4.	Prof. Mark J. Eitelberg Systems Management Department Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943	2
5.	Prof. Kevin R. Gue Systems Management Department Naval Postgraduate School Monterey CA 93943	2
6.	Capt. Robert H. Miller, USN, Ret. P.O. Box 1007 Willow Grove PA 19090	2
7.	Col. Ronald D. Ray, USMC, Ret. P.O Box 1136 Crestwood KY 40014	1
8.	Chap. Lindsey E. Arnold Leadership Division Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel Department of the Army Washington DC 20310-0300	1

- | | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 9. | Chap. G. Gibson
Chief of Chaplains
Bureau of Navy Personnel
Department of the Navy
Washington DC 20350-5000 | 1 |
| 10. | Rev. Bob Vickers
Chaplaincy Division
Home Mission Board Southern Baptist Convention
4200 North Point Parkway
Alpharetta GO 30202-4174 | 1 |
| 11. | Mr. Dwight Chapman
General Baptist World Headquarters
100 Stinson Drive
Poplar Bluff MO 63901 | 1 |